



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_50645
Title of the Manuscript:	Selective Alteration of the Root Morphology of Arabidopsis thaliana by Synthetic Anion Transporters (SATs)
Type of the 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>)

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	NO	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1.pg.13-Compounds used –In previous research work</p> <p>2.References- can include more recent year references</p> <p>3. References- Full stop at the end of the references.</p>	<p>1. The reviewer points to page 13 and notes: "Compounds used –In previous research work." I can interpret this in two ways. First, it may mean that the reviewer wants us to include more information about our previous plant studies. We noted in the introduction that our previous studies involved lariat ethers and hydrophiles, which are structurally unrelated to the heptapeptide SATs. The hydrophiles, lariat ethers, and SATs are all ion transporters, but the first two classes of compounds are cation transporters and the SATs are anion transporters. Since the compounds of the present study interact with anions rather than cations, the combination of different interactions and different structural types would make any comparison uninformative. I have clarified this in the introduction. I have also added a brief section pointing to recent work on root morphological changes not involving ion complexing agents. This will, I think, satisfy the reviewers' points 2 and 4 in their respective responses.</p> <p>An alternate interpretation is that the reviewer is unfamiliar with our previous work on SATs. Assuming that this may be the case for those readers more interested in plant biology than in chemistry, we have therefore added a brief background section on SAT chemistry.</p> <p>I have added several recent references to the work of others insofar as the work relates to alterations in root morphology. Although these reports do not involve anion binders, they are recent studies of changes in plant growth.</p> <p>2. See my response above.</p> <p>3. We found three references that were not terminated by a full stop (period).</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		These have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	