

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_89009
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of NaCl and brassinolide in Stevia rebaudiana under in vitro condition
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.	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 1.	The whole write-up could be put in the acceptable format for this Journal (IJPSS).	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Corrections could be effected as here suggested –</p> <p>1. Line 18: stress, Stevia spp. ; Line 20: Stevia rebaudiana Bertoni ; Line 22: cuttings, and the seeds ; Line 23: in food. ; Line 24: producing it's planting materials ; Line 25: In Stevia rebaudiana cultivation, high soil salinity is a key agricultural constraint, because ; Line 26: output [2], because under high levels of salt (Na+) in the soil, most crop ; Line 32: As a result, it is critical ; Line 35:BL application has been ; Line 49: Skoog [17]. ; Line 52: in the culture room ; Line 53: details were as ; Line 55: 120 mM and150 mM gL-1 . ; Line 56: 3µM and 4µM gL-.</p> <p>2. Line 61: 2.1.1 ; Line 65: 2.1.2 Length of shoot (cm explant-1) ; Line 66: The shoot length of explants were measured ; Line 67: lengths were calculated ; centimeters (cm). Line 68: 2.1.3 ; Line 69: per explant was ; Line 70: 2.1.4 Line 72: Number of explants that survived ; Line 73: 2.1.5 ; Line 74: of shoot was ; Line 78: 2.1.6 ; Line 82: 2.2 Photosynthetic ; Line 83: Lichanthaler [19] method - (if possible could put Lichanthaler (1984) under the End References) ; Line 84: 2.3 Statistical analysis ; Within Tables 1 and 2; Line 121 to 122: Could change – Leaf Number to – Number of Leaves ; Shoot Fresh Weight ; Shoot Dry Weight ; Lines 124 and 159: Could delete - using Duncan's multiple range test ; Lines 126 and 163: Could Change Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 to – Plate 1. ; Plate 2 ; Line 128: number of leaves, shoot fresh and dry weight,</p> <p>3. Babylon Journal University-Pure and Applied Science. 2010;18(4); ; Line 284: Effect ; Line 287: (Saccharum spp.).</p>	
Optional/General comments	Good work, could put more effort to re-read and correct this write-up to become more Perfect.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Grace O. Tona
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria