

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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors carried out work on the Response of seed priming to varied levels of salinity in safflower. current studies are highly valuable and important in the field of agriculture, I have the following specific comments for the Authors as follows and Some improvement in the manuscript have been suggested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. KCL" should be "KCl" for consistency with other chemical names. 2. Specify the concentrations of the priming chemicals used for better context. 3. Reframe: Priming is not a simple emulation of the early imbibitions stage of germination 4. Reframe:Finally, such seeds were used for seed germination test for assessing the seed quality parameters 5. Replace in instead of with: Germination paper were immersed with five different saline sol 6. Need Clarity: The first count was taken on 4th day (Anonymous, 2013). 7. Consider expanding on the importance of safflower in stress conditions and its relevance in agronomy to strengthen the introduction. 8. When citing figures like the percentage of arable lands impacted by salinization, provide references to authoritative sources. 9. Provide more background on how safflower's physiological responses to salinity stress have been studied in previous research. 10. The explanation of seed priming is good, but could benefit from more detailed references to studies using it on safflower or similar crops under salinity stress. 11. Clarify how seeds were primed – mention if they were soaked in the chemical solutions at different temperatures or any other specifics. 12. Ensure that the randomization process is clearly described for reproducibility. 13. After were add also: The seedlings used for measuring the shoot length were used for measuring the root length." 14. Use consistent past tense in the methodology and results: Germination factor is calculated 15. Use under salinity: safflower seeds in salinity condition 16. The "@" symbol is typically not used in scientific writing for concentration levels. Interpret entire result with last five year references 17. Should use the plural form "have" instead of "has" since "indices" is plural. 18. Grammatically correct to write, "Seedling vigour index I and seedling vigour index II were 2297 and 17.18, respectively 19. These results into rapid embryo growth: This phrase is grammatically incorrect. 20. In result3.1: KCl seed priming seeds has showed the highest first count (%),There is a significant decrease and check throughout – Grammatical mistakes 21. And the least was recorded by unprimed seeds: The use of "And" at the beginning of the sentence is unnecessary 22. Expand on why KCl and salicylic acid had the most significant effect and how they compare to other priming treatments. 23. Ensure consistent use of the abbreviation "SVI" throughout. 24. The SVI-I and SVI II increased when the salt concentration decreased, which revealed that increased sodium chloride concentration caused a detrimental effect in the seed. This sentence need to be clear 25. Discuss the biological mechanisms behind how KCl and salicylic acid affect seed physiology, particularly under salt stress. 26. Need clarity and grammatical errors are there: each by following between paper method and rolled towels was incubated in the seed germination room maintained at 25 ± 2 °C temperature and 90 ± 5 per cent relative humidity. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Anbarasi G</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Annamalai University, India</p>