

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125084
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF BIOSYNTHESIZED ZINC NANOPARTICLES ON WHEAT (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) PRODUCTION
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>
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.	The work is important because it proposes a new technique to improve plant growth, without using many agrochemicals.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is incomplete. The variable priming is missing, since it is the one that will also influence the growth of the plant.	
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.	the abstract is correct	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is correct. The material and methods should include the procedure for obtaining the nanoparticle. The treatments lack the witness and should include a To and also only Zn at 500 ppm.	
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.	The manuscript lacked consistency by not designing the treatments well. I consider that it is not consistent to affirm that the proposed treatments are those that influence the growth of the plant when a To is missing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	references correct	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	appropriate language	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Julio Roger Chico Ruiz
Department, University & Country	University National Of Trujillo, Peru