

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_99715
Title of the Manuscript:	Physiological screening of potato varieties on in vitro salinity condition
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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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>This study shows details of salinity in some varieties of potatoes and offers enough fresh knowledge in the area of plant physiology. However, the authors do not give a convincing justification for why this research is necessary or give any reasons for doing so. The specificity of this research are not demonstrated by any scientific comparisons in the introduction.</p> <p>Because of the vagueness of the title, it appears to be a review paper.</p> <p>The content of the abstract is informative enough to summarize the research findings and complies with the criteria.</p> <p>The manuscript's structure and subsections are appropriate. A more captivating depiction is required because the data obtained is simple and straightforward. Additionally, the discussion should be expanded upon to make it more thorough, particularly in regards to the comparison with earlier research and the superiority of the findings in the agricultural industry.</p> <p>Yes, I believe the data gathered is appropriate for science and in conformity with the relevant scientific domains.</p> <p>I believe that many of the references in the list still date from more than ten years ago. For a period of less than ten years, we advise you to add more recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English in this paper still needs to be improved to make it more communicative</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This work can be approved with a notation indicating it still needs to be improved in light of reviewers' suggestions.</p>	

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:	Hery Purnobasuki
Department, University & Country	Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia