

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95385
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review - Approaches to combat salt stress in wheat crop
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<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- Yes, because deals with some strategies to reduce deleterious effects of salinity stress in wheat a very important food</p> <p>2- No. Since this is a review other approaches should be included, as the author write in the final sentence of the conclusion. The article mention only the transgenic wheat. An alternative title: A review – Some approaches to combat salt stress in wheat crop</p> <p>3- The abstract of the Article is comprehensive</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure is appropriate</p> <p>5- The references are sufficient and there are some important not recent references as well as recent references. But the author forgot at the references, of writing several names using italic (Examples Triticum, aestivum, Vigna unguiculata, Panicum maximum, Solanum melongena. Ahmad et al (2013), Zhao et al,2014), Sun et al., 2015; Barini, 2013; are in the text but not in the references. The reference Kleist 2014 is not complete. The text say Rasool 1983 but in the references Rasool 2013 The text say Alam 2017 but in the references Aslam 2017 The text say Shnozaki 2007 but in the references Shnizaki 2007 The text say Zang 2013 but in the references Zhang 2013 The text say Barragan 2012 but in the references Barragán 2012</p> <p>6- No, in my opinion there are some mistakes in the conclusion: The author say that Screening in vivo or in vitro methods must be developed. At literature such methods already are available. The author say that we are at the infancy stage in understanding salinity. But the author in his text proved the contrary as it is possible to read at the itens related to Mechanism for salt tolerance.</p> <p>If the original title is maintained the author should include in the revision other approaches such as: Conventional breeding, marker assisted selection, mutation induction. This can be done summarizing the 5 initial pages, that are to long</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the English is very clear	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Augusto Tulmann Neto
Department, University & Country	São Paulo State University, Brazil