

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 Please, add Wheat to the Keywords. Please, along the article, replace @ by at Add the aim of the study to the end of the Introduction.	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 manuscript includes more results and hard work. But the author(s) can't deal with the results and connect it with a good and rich discussion. The following article includes the same manner and content as the present manuscript: Biosynthesized Zinc Nanoparticles and their Plant Growth-Promoting Effect on Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) Cultivation. Journal of Scientific Research and Reports 30 (9):148-58.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 is good and sound, but needs an enrich discussion and more clarification and dealing with the results. Many recent articles will be helpful.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	To some extent.	
Optional/General comments	Why the author(s) didn't add any Figures for the characterization of the nanoparticles [Scanning Electron Microscope, for example]. Disadvantages of using nanoparticles in the agricultural field can be added to the discussion.	

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:	Shadia M. Abdel-Aziz
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt