

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_99165
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical characterization of two contrasting genotypes of <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> Willd. to salinity in a hydroponic system at the seedling stage
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, the manuscript is very important for scientific community. <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> is promising for future prospect of food security as it has high nutritional property. Its another species <i>Chenopodium album</i> commonly known as bathua in India is an important source of vitamin and mineral and good for vision. As its cultivation is easy and less labour intensive it play an important role in national economy. Yes, title of the manuscript is suitable and comprehensive. Due to continuous and high dose of use of fertilizer soil and water bodies both get polluted and there might be increase in salinity value. So, tolerance level of the crop should be monitored and factor associated with it should be determined. Yes Yes Yes author has written manuscript in correlated and scientific manner. Yes, author has tried well to cite the manuscript with recent references but area under cultivation, production and productivity and major losses due to nitrogen deficiencies should be mentioned. Author should try to follow the one type of pattern to arrange the references. There is major concern in the reference section as it has not arranged properly. Manuscript seems that author has directly copied the file. And it seems there is som problem in references as after selecting one refrence whole references is getting selected and cooment is not able to add in middle page of the references except first and last page	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Author has written quite Satisfactorily language	
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mukul Kumar
Department, University & Country	Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, India