

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127568
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of seed priming to varied levels of salinity in safflower
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study addresses salinity stress, a critical agricultural challenge. Focus on safflower, a moderately salt-tolerant and underutilized crop.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	While the context of safflower and salinity is important, some details (e.g., therapeutic properties of safflower flowers) are tangential to the study focus. Compact the introduction part with some relevant recent reference. Rewrite materials and method part focusing the following points. Which variety/genotype was used for the experiment? The experiment uses only two replications, which is insufficient for robust statistical analysis. Standard practice suggests at least three replications to minimize error. The salinity levels (0, 5, 10, 15, and 20 g L ⁻¹ NaCl) seem arbitrary. Justification for these concentrations, particularly their relevance to field conditions, is missing. How do they correlate with actual soil salinity? The manuscript lacks information on the concentrations of KCl, salicylic acid, chitosan, and other chemicals used for seed priming. Concentrations can significantly affect outcomes and reproducibility. The duration for which seeds were exposed to salinity stress is not clearly mentioned. Was it consistent across treatments? This is critical for reproducibility. Incorporate recent literature (post-2015) focusing on safflower and seed priming under salinity to strengthen the manuscript's relevance. This manuscript has potential but needs significant revisions to address redundancy, enhance mechanistic explanations, and ensure clarity. Incorporating these suggestions will elevate its scientific contribution and relevance.	
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.	Revision is required	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The above content appears to be scientifically structured, but it has some gaps and areas that need refinement for better clarity and accuracy...so revise it as per the suggestion	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are outdated (e.g., Hopper et al., 1979; Bouaziz and Hicks, 1990). More recent studies (post-2015) on seed priming or salinity tolerance in oilseeds should be cited.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Discuss limitations of the study (e.g., scalability of findings, applicability across genotypes) and suggest future directions.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is scientifically correct but lacks in terms of methodology and data interpretation innovation, depth in mechanistic explanations, and a polished presentation. addressing redundancy, and improving discussion sections will significantly improve its scientific impact.	

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:	Apurba Pal
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India