

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_102849
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Water Deficit Stress and Symbiosis with <i>Micrococcus yunnanensis</i> on Seed Biochemistry of <i>Camelina sativa</i>
Type of the Article	Review

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.journalapri.com/index.php/APRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) The topic is useful but the whole manuscript needs a serious review, The entire study needs a review and address of the incorporations of suggestions.</p> <p>2) Title is not clear; it needs to be changed.</p> <p>3) Abstract is not adequate, only introduction and result are enough explained but the methodological part is missing, it also needs a review.</p> <p>4) Not much clear, Research design is missing, conceptual frame and theoretical consideration is not seen.</p> <p>5) The effort is appreciable but the writer needs to be learned many things about the research methodology, mainly during experimental research its types and analysis strategies.</p> <p>6) The references are not as per APA-16, so without getting a citation version, this is considering a copy paste types citation, which has no relevancy.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Apart from grammar mistake, the scientific words are appropriate.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The missing part in the article: -1) identity and affiliation of the author, 2) PG report, 3) Consent form or questions sample or model, 4) APA-16 citation format.</p> <p>The most critique of this article is lack of methodology recorded. No evidence of research problems, no adequate conceptual framework or relevant theoretical verification of study. No clear methods of analysis and limitation of the study, it seems that the author is either employee or directly associated with some higher ranking in the scientific laboratory where such experimental job is done (<i>Research Greenhouse of Biology Department, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran from December to February 2018. Camelina "Soheil cultivar" was selected as plant material and obtained from Bisetoon Shafa Co., Kermanshah, Iran</i>). In such case he/ she must get a consent from the department and the purpose of this publication must be disclosed, is it for the academic or promotional purpose? Also, this disclosure will validate the authors work from the various legal aspects.</p> <p>The writing is not academic its just like a project-based report, where no specification of research methods is highlighted. No specific maps, no enough literatures in the regional, nation and local levels. Some PG contents detected during review and suggesting for similarity check with AI uses, Grammers are poor and a serious review is suggesting.</p> <p>The present level of the article is not eligible to print in any DOI, Scopus or crossref related indexing.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raju Chhetri
Department, University & Country	Mewar University, Srinivas University, India