

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJA_99165</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Biochemical characterization of two contrasting genotypes of <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> Willd. to salinity in a hydroponic system at the seedling stage</b>
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	The manuscript strengthened the salt-resistant property of Chadmo as indicated in the biochemical responses to the treatment 400 nM NaCl. This is an important adaptation to changes in environment such as climate change. Hence, a promising genotype for food security. Biochemical characterization and <b>responses</b> of two Genotypes of <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> Willd. to salinity in a hydroponic system <del>at the seedling stage.</del> <b>Note that the seedling stage can be written in the Materials and Methods (2.1)</b> You may want to mention the research design used in the abstract Please clarify: You mentioned in 2.1 that you used 6 biological replicates but in 2.3, you mentioned only 3 biological replicates. Which is which? You also mentioned that you distributed the plants in Complete Randomized Block Design. Is it "the plants"? Or the treatments which are supposed to be laid out? Or plants in each treatment were laid out? Pls clarify. It may be better to put the conclusion and recommendations in one section to highlight the results of the research and weaned out from the discussion part The manuscript is scientifically correct following the steps of the scientific method An updated list of more recent references may be necessary.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Has good command of English for scholarly publication	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	<b>Jacqueline v. Bagunu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pampanga State Agricultural University, Philippines</b>