



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_47894
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, Photosynthesis and Quality of Water Spinach (<i>Ipomoea aquatica</i>) as influenced by Magnetic nanoparticles (MNP) application
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:

(<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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Make sure the is proper flow of English – take care of tenses (I have tried to indicate in the text). Consider adding the term “Malaysia” in the title- this helps reader to know where the trial was done.</p> <p>Note that the key words should not emanate from the title. Do not use words which are in your title as key words</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -remove the hypotheses in the document at the end of the introduction – this is no longer the thesis but a scientific manuscript - Under materials and method section- the authors to check if indeed Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was what they used- in results section- DMRT is shown- I doubt if SPSS has this options. Why not SAS, Genstat or R? - In the tables – the letters superscripts a, b, c are shown. It is good practice to assign “a” to the highest value. - The author(s) – has (have) – plant shoots as well as shoot length (I propose they adopt one of them and not both)- the message is the same. What is the difference between plant and shoot length? - Section 3.5 plant temperature- the authors want to make us believe that the higher the nanoparticles, the higher the temperature... That is not correct. Let authors report what is there- note that even 0 m/L was superior to 50 and 150 mg/L -Consider giving acknowledgements 	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is quite interesting and once changes/corrects are made and language improved and once published, the readers will enjoy and hopefully will attract wide readership	

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Joseph Onyango Gweyi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Kenyatta University, Kenya</i>