

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125082
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOFORTIFICATION OF WHEAT USING BIOLOGICALLY SYNTHESIZED ZINC NANOPARTICLES
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The subject title is good according to the environmental attitude. The production of healthy products is welcomed.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Using biologically synthesized zinc nanoparticles for wheat biofortification</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Add keywords "PGPR." The first sentence should be related to the importance of the topic. What type of design is used? Description of treatment? Important dates</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The author has not explained the topic well in the introduction and has expressed most of the generalities. The type of statistical design is problematic, maybe I have a different opinion. There is no analysis of variance table and only the mean comparison table is provided. Scientific principles were not observed in the reference (especially the reference date). Most of the generalities are mentioned in the introduction. It is better to express nano-zinc fertilizer, bacteria, wheat growth and mentioned traits in the results. There is no need to mention unexamined topics. The content "In addition, zinc plays an important role in the biosynthesis of proteins, carbohydrates, lipids and nucleic acids in plants (Sturikova et al., 2018)" should be removed. Protein, carbohydrate, lipid and nucleic acids and other similar things were not measured or were not observed in the results, what is the reason for mentioning them in the introduction? Planting and harvesting dates should be mentioned. Was foliar spraying done in the initial phase of the bush cluster with the defined treatments? including the cases of zinc nanoparticles and growth-promoting bacteria. What is the effect of Pseudomonas at this stage? Mention the relevant reference. If you used two treatments (priming and foliar spraying), isn't the completely randomized block design suspicious? Variance analysis table was not found in the results. CV and trait correlation can play an important role in data analysis and validation. Therefore, it is necessary to include it in the results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Some references are very old. It is better to update the sources. It is better to check the type of writing of sources and pay attention to the reference year.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No It is better to do literary editing	
Optional/General comments	The sources used in the introduction are very limited and the text of each part is long. It is better to use a newer and more number of sources. NO, Based on the provided content, there are no explicit indications of competing interests mentioned in the manuscript. Based on the information available, there are no apparent competing interest issues in the manuscript NO, Based on the provided content, there are no explicit ethical issues mentioned in the manuscript. The content does not raise any ethical concerns related to human or animal subjects, data integrity, authorship, or conflicts of interest	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusof Niknejad
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran