

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121242
Title of the Manuscript:	Biological priming: An eco-friendly alternative for inducing salinity tolerance and augmenting plant growth in Brassica juncea
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article is very creative, conducting experiments on mustard greens of different genotypes using innovative experimental methods. The research content is rich and the data analysis is comprehensive.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes,it is.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The experimental methods used in this paper include random sampling and control variable method. The results obtained were also compared with the arithmetic mean. The comparison of the results is quite convincing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>1.The article mentions a large number of experiments, but no experimental images are seen in the article. If you could add some experimental photos, it would be more persuasive.</p> <p>2.In RESULT AND DISCUSSION, the mean value of each character was worked out by dividing the totals by the corresponding number of observations. How do you determine the number of observations and observation methods?</p> <p>3.In ABSTRACT,Various quantitative characters and qualitative characters were observed and studied.What are the quantitative characters and qualitative characters mentioned in the article, and is there a theoretical basis and quantitative standard?</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Di Liang
Department, University & Country	Nanning Normal University, China