



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_47542
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Halopriming along with Hydropriming on Germination of Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) Seeds.
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	<p>According to GUIDELINE FOR AUTHORS (available on journal's page), Research Papers should follow the structure of Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, Conclusion. This article has not a conclusion. Please correct that.</p> <p>Methodology: Please inform the formula used to find the TSG and FEP.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: To Explain all acronyms used in the 1st paragraph and table 1. Where is the statistical significance on graphics? It is essential for discussion of the founded results.</p> <p>According to GUIDELINE FOR AUTHORS, the figures and table should be cited in the text. Please correct it.</p> <p>According to GUIDELINE FOR AUTHORS, Table headings should be placed above the table. In this paper the tables headings are missing. Please correct that.</p> <p>Where is the discussion??? This should interpret the significance of the findings of the work. Citations should be given in support of the findings.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: Check the beginning of 2nd paragraph.</p>	
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Schirley Costalonga
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Brazil