



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_66814
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF NAACL ON SEED GERMINATION, CONTENT OF PHOTOSYNTHETIC PIGMENTS, SUGARS, AND ACTIVITY OF PHOTOSYSTEM II IN MAIZE (ZEA MAYS L.) LEAVES
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1 - The name of the species must be in italics.</p> <p>2 - I think you should explore the state of the art further, with a view to introducing some effects that can be observed because they have already been observed by other authors. There are also statements in the introduction that lack bibliography, such as the sentence in line 7.</p> <p>3 - The description of the methods is too simplified and mixed up, and never indicates the sampling procedure. They should be rewritten in a clearer way, it says that they should be written so that they can be reproduced. The quantification of germination (%) and seed germination energy is not described.</p> <p>4 -In the statistical treatment they should indicate that only descriptive statistics were performed. However, it would be interesting to apply ANOVA to identify statistically significant differences between concentration mode and genotypes.</p> <p>5- Correct <i>Karotenoids</i> for carotenoids</p> <p>6- In the results table, two of the parameters analysed have no standard deviation. If they do not because there are no replicates, then the data have no significant relevance for publication.</p> <p>7 - There is a lot of description of results of other authors in the discussion with few bibliographical references and with little direct link to the data obtained. I propose that you rewrite in order to be more direct and critical about your results</p> <p>8- In the conclusion you mention which varieties are more resistant, but in the discussion you do not go into detail about this fact in view of the results obtained.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>1 - mmol is not a unit commonly used by other authors, they could convert to mM (mmol/L) for better comparison with other articles.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Filipa Rego Pinto
Department, University & Country	Portugal