

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121777
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of zinc application on growth, yield and economics of dual-purpose oats (<i>Avena sativa</i> L.) in North Eastern Region of India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a significant gap in current research and provides new insights that could influence future studies and practical applications. I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough analysis, clear presentation, and the practical relevance of its conclusions.</p> <p>In general, this paper is well-written and produce some significant results, I have only the following minor comments:</p> <p>1. The first letter for each key word should be capital;</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, article title is suitable</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>The text is well written in abstract and the essay deals with a scientifically important subject.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized. Each section flows logically, starting with a detailed introduction that sets the context, followed by a clear methodology section. The results are presented in a concise manner, supported by relevant data</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>Please remove the figure no 2 from result section and This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodology, comprehensive literature review, and clear presentation of results. The experimental design is well-structured, ensuring reproducibility and validity of the findings. Additionally, the data analysis employs appropriate statistical techniques, which strengthens the reliability of the conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are both sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant studies up to the present year.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor editing of English language required</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>NA</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Rohit Kumar
Department, University & Country	GLA University, India