

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_81180
Title of the Manuscript:	Mineral Uptake, Total Polyphenols and Total Flavonoids of Barley as Affected by Tillage Practices under Semi-Arid Conditions
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.journalapj.com/index.php/APRJ/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>My major concern with the study design is that glyphosate was used on the non-tilled soil, but not on the conventional tillage. Glyphosate has been shown to influence nutrient and mineral content. Can you add this into your discussion as a limitation? How might this unaccounted confounder have contributed to your findings? Can you make suggestions for future work in this area?</p> <p>In 2.1, you have referred to Figure 1, but this figure wasn't included in the manuscript. Please remove or add the figure in and rename your other figures.</p> <p>Please be consistent with your use of acronyms throughout and double check them: e.g., keep "conventional tillage" as such in your discussion (not just "tillage").</p> <p>Please make sure you define "CT" and "NT" in your figures, or in your figure headings. The figures need to be able to interpreted without reading the text.</p> <p>Please change "N" to "Na in the Results of your abstract, and make sure this is consistent throughout your manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>A few minor grammatical comments and suggestions:</p> <p>Abstract: "Conservation agriculture has been recommended" "Considering the partial correlation based on plant stages, no significant correlations had been noted."</p> <p>Introduction: "...148478878 tonnes, respectively" "Management practices such as tillage have been shown to influence nutrient content" "Cereal antioxidant contents could differ..." "...to deal with weeds to prepare seedbed and to avoid crust formation." "Nevertheless, these practices contribute to climate change and monocultures..." "...the interaction between many other factors."</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Please be consistent with the use of superscripts for kg.ha⁻¹ "Aerial parts were dried..." "...1 g of dried sample..." You don't need to capitalize "Pearson correlation" or "Duncan post-hoc test" "...main role in plant metabolism"</p> <p>Figures: Is there any way for you to adjust the "Ca" and "Na" labels in Fig. 1 to be on the same line? This would immensely improve readability.</p> <p>Correct the spelling of "conventional" in your figure headings, and uncapitalize "no tillage".</p> <p>Please correct to "not applicable" for your ethics and consent.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Thank you for the opportunity to review a well-written manuscript on an interesting topic.	

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:	<i>Nadine Vogt</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Of Guelph, Canada</i>