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) There are some references not found in authors' reference list as follow: 1.1 Farooq et al., 2005 1.2 Calviño et al., 2012 1.3 Asunta et al., 2019 1.4 Netondo, 2004 2) Line 55: Seeds of three finger millet varieties (Serena, Seredo and Gadam)…, but in all Table and all Figure composed of Serena, Sc Sila and Gadam. What's it? Seredo or Sc Sila. 3) Materials and Methods: Authors should specify their experimental design, but their manuscript did not write their experimental design. 4) Line 80: under normal room temperature, authors should add the temperature (….°C). 5) Line 115: significant differences in root and shoot length among varieties and treatments (Fig. 3). But in Fig 3 showed the leaf relative water content. It's not root and shoot length. What's exactly? 6) Fig 1: Authors should fill A, B and C in each picture. 7) Fig 2, 3 and 4, Authors should fill the alphabets on each bar graph in order to show the statistically significant differences. 8) Title of Table 1: Effect of NaCl concentrations on shoot height and root length. Is it only "Effect of NaCl concentrations on shoot height"?. 9) Table 1 and Table 2, authors should add the F-test, values of LSD and C.V.(%). 10) Authors should add their discussion that why sorghum's root did not show any response to NaCl?, while sorghum's shoot showed the sensitive responses to NaCl.	1. These has been corrected as suggested by the reviewer. Netondo et al was already in the manuscript. 2. This has been corrected 3. The experimental design of the study has been incorporated in the Statistical analysis section 4. This has been corrected as suggested 5. This has been clarified as advised 6. A, B and C have been put in each picture 7. Alphabets on each bar graph have been put as suggested by the reviewer 8. The title has been corrected 9. We did not see the need to add the phrase suggested by the reviewer 10. A brief discussion has been inserted
Minor REVISION comments	1) Line 264: Lack of Journal's name, volume (issue), and page number. 2) Line 275: Lack of page number	These has been corrected as suggested by the reviewer
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)*	