

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_89192
Title of the Manuscript:	LABORATORY GERMINATION EXPERIMENT FOR ASSESSING THE PHYTOTOXIC EFFECT OF ARSENIC ON THE GROWTH ATTRIBUTE OF DIFFERENT CROPS
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>In the introduction can you talk about the differences between arsenite and arsenate, what's most dangerous for human consume, for plant toxicity? and what's the most common form or arsenic in productions crops?</p> <p>In the first paragraph of the results when you compare the germination percentage in control and one concentration of arsenic it's confuse mentioned all de species and percentages separately, in the same way why did you emphasise in 40 gml-1? In the same paragraph you mentioned the concentration of 60 mg L-1 but didn't explain the observation. At the end of the paragraph, you discussed your observations in mg L-1 against uM, did you consider important talk in the same units?</p> <p>In section 3.1 in the figure 1 you used statistics analysis but in text there weren't any mention about it!</p> <p>In section 3.2 in the second paragraph, it's no clear the concentration that is statistical significance in the affectation in Root and Shoot length. In the same way were you talking for all kind of seed using in the experiment or some in special?</p> <p>In figures 2-6 there were 11 points (observations) by analysis but in the x-axis the values didn't correspond to the concentration mentioned in materials and method.</p> <p>The explanation, comparation and discussion of the results of five figures was too superficial didn't use all the information.</p> <p>In section 3.3 you mentioned a decreased in the seeding vigour index in the first paragraph, but you didn't mention the concentration of arsenic responsible for that effect. In the same section you din't use all the information of the table 7 only mentioned it but didn't explain the statistic.</p> <p>In section 3.4 you only mentioned some words for the figure 8 but you didn't explain anything.</p> <p>The graphic used in the section 3.5 it wasn't clear to see all the results by seed. In the same section you didn't use the information of the statistic only mentioned some random data.</p> <p>The conclusion didn't conclude the information showed in the results and statistics only mentioned but didn't use the absolute values and previous information.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction second paragraph "a number of" it's better "in several nation".</p> <p>You mentioned the word "offive" what it's means?</p> <p>In section 2.1 you wrote "sterilised" in the same section you mentioned "the seeds were filtered" literati did you filter the seeds? What's the pore size?, in the same section you mentioned various concentrations of sodium hypochlorite what was that concentrations?</p> <p>were there some effects related to the use of distillate water whit out any anion or cation in the germination process?</p> <p>were there some effects related to the use of sodium salts as a source of arsenic? I mean the sodium in the solution didn't affect the germination ratio?</p> <p>In section 2.2.4 dry matter production did you compare the original weight of the seed and the weight of the dry matter?</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>There were many orthographical errors in text that might be reviewed.</p> <p>There were some mistakes in in the time used in text, sometimes you used past tens and sometimes used present continuous.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jonatan Carmen Rangel Nuñez
Department, University & Country	University of Guanajuato, México