

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_96767
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing drought tolerance of quinoa ( <i>Chenopodium quinoa</i> ) through potassium and boron application
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:

(<https://www.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/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 REVISION</b> 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>	1. I think the manuscript is important for scientific community especially in climate change condition. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract is clear and comprehensive. 4. The structure of the manuscript is good. 5. Yes, I think so. 6. There are many references that found in the list and not included in text. The method section need reference citations.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is clear and good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. It was good to follow that antioxidant enzymes e.g. superoxide dismutase, glutathione reductase, and glutathione transferase and compare the parameters during normal condition and drought. 2. There are some linguistic corrections in text. 3. The manuscript includes 17 figures (too much), In the future they can combine the figures in amazing and clear figures.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abeer Galal Shokeer</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>