

Editor's Comment:

The study would be interesting if enough information was provided. Quite a lot is missing and the informative conclusion is still lacking because of insufficient information on the results and discussion section. I recommend that this paper be accepted after major revision before publication. I suggest the paper be given more time so that the authors can refine the results and discussion section before publishing it to the international community. If time is not there, the authors need to resubmit the fresh manuscript for reconsideration. It cannot be published the way it is at the moment because of the following:

- They need to include statistical test used in abstract
- In the introduction section, the authors spent much time on less important information with regard to this study. The introduction would give information on variation of metabolites. Why majorly focus on India (lines 44-72)? Is it the only place cotton is grown or the only beneficiary of this study? Currently the information provided may not help a reader understand the gist of the research topic. Why non polar metabolites? Grammatical error line 93
- The authors must provide sufficient information on how the study would lead the better understanding of overall water stress tolerance mechanism.
- In the Results and Discussion section, authors did not give sufficient explanations for the metabolite variations under different conditions.
- Due to the preceding bulletin, the conclusion hangs in balance.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Nasifu Kerebba
Assistant Lecturer, Department of Chemistry, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.