Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_50834**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Physiological and biochemical analyses of sorghum varieties reveal differential responses to salinity stress**
Type of the Article	**Original research paper**

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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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	1. **Abstract needs to be revised** 2. **Background is too short.** 3. **The scientific name must be mentioned** 4. **To identify variation among variety's in response to salinity , some parameters can be estimated like** $\text{Shoot length Stress Index (\%)} = {}^{\text{shoot length of stressed plant}}/_{\text{shoot length of control plants}} \times 100$ $\text{Root Length Stress Index (\%)} = {}^{\text{root length of stressed plant}}/_{\text{root length of control plants}} \times 100$ $\text{Seedling vigour index} = \text{germination percentage} \times \text{seedling length}$ $\text{Seedling length} = \text{shoot length} + \text{root length}$ You can find these parameter in this article : Germination and Physiological Traits to Ascertain the Ability of Hormonal Priming to Improve Salinity Tolerance in Sorghum bicolor	• We did not see the reasons for revising the abstract. The reviewer should clearly indicate how the abstract should bee reviewed. In our knowledge, an abstract should have a brief introduction, the research gap which was being addressed, the aim of the study, methodology in brief, results in brief and significance and or conclusion of the study. All these are in the abstract. We need to be precisely guided on how to review it • Based on the results of the study, there was no need of writing a long introduction • We have mentioned the scientific name of sorghum in the introduction. We do not see the need for a long title with the scientific name • The results clearly say the percentages of germination. No need of the formula. The formula for RWC has been inserted in the manuscript and we do not see the need of changing it. • We clearly referred to many articles including the one suggested as we adopted a different style than the suggested one.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	