



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14099
Title of the Manuscript:	Variations in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ rates and Crassulacean acid metabolism of six different <i>Coleus</i> species
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The study is interesting and valuable Design of the study and sampling method may need a little more detail. Data treatment and analysis may need to be specified a little. (more detail to see reviewed pdf file having notes, same as follows)	Design has been added in the text. No treatment has been given to the plants in this manuscript. All plants are used under control conditions only as mentioned in the materials and methods.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	"t" meaning in a blackest in all figs and table 1 need explaining somewhere. In line 114: If saying "significantly", ANOVA is needed. And not "higher", but "lower " Polypodieace→Polypodiaceae	Anova has been used in for studying the significance of the data for all experiments and the P value has been mentioned for each and every experiment as obtained during the T test. Mistake corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	- As I read, only in testing contents of starch and sucrose there stated leaf area of sample , how can other contents such as acid, glucose, etc be gotten in unit of area m⁻²? - The six species is water hardness and cultivated in hilly regions lack of water, why “well watered” and no detail of watering in the study? We know that the water condition is very important for plant growth and watering amount and frequency are pivotal for biomass. And to have bigger biomass in well watering can’t mean to have bigger biomass in conditions of lack of water. - In line 166: 200 mM . Is the unit right? - Fig.4 is equal to Fig.1? - Table 1: Aerial biomass What’s the composition of aerial biomass? Is data calculated from a leaf (or leaves)? If data from more than 3 samples then we can use ANOVA . If data is from 5 readings of a sample, we can't use ANOVA, and we can't sure whether there is significant difference between species. From so little SE, we can judge that data is an average of 5 readings of one sample. If that, what's meaning for "P<0.05"? - Pay attention to noted line such as 22,27,35,51,52,53,110,112,114,151,183-189,281-287 ,330-345,390-399 etc. and to see whether modification is needed	All experiments were carried out using the standard protocols and the results were mentioned in the same units. The information about the <i>Coleus</i> plant capability of growing without water was mentioned in the introduction chapter. NO TREATMENT was given to the plants in this particular experiments and all the data is generated by conducting the experiments on <i>Coleus</i> plants under strictly control conditions only as mentioned in the materials and methods. Reference has been cited. Figure 1 has been changed. Aerial biomass is measured for the mass of the plant above the soil. Experiments were conducted by using five samples not readings. Hence ANOVA was used. Statistical analysis has been added as 2.6. in the materials and methods describing the significance of the values. All the modifications suggested were changed in the text.
---	--	--