



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15110
Title of the Manuscript:	Mechanism of nanosilicon-mediated alleviation of salinity stress in faba bean (<i>Vicia faba</i> L.) plants
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	<u>There are some points should be corrected and reconsidered:</u> 1-The data of one parameter is represented in 2 tables, while the data of another parameter is represented in one figure. why? So, I suggest that the data in the second table (Mean of main effects) should be deleted, where this table is not necessary. 2-There are errors in the calculation of EC% and MSI%. The values of parameters should be equal 100, according to the method used as in materials and methods : $MSI = [1 - (C1/C2)] \times 100$ e.g. in control, EL or EC%=13.5 and MSI=60.5 $13.5 + 60.5 = 74$ (not correct) it must be = 100 So, these values should recalculated, and one parameter (EC% or MSI) from both is enough, because it gives the same indication. 3- In materials and methods section, either electrolyte leakage (lane 146) or membrane stability index (lane 155) should be deleted , because the method used in membrane stability index gives the same methods of EC%. 4- The values of the statistical analysis in the figures are represented by the <u>vertical bars $\pm$ SD</u>, while these values are not presented in the tables. So, I advise that the statistical analysis should be the same in both	1-Tables of main effects are deleted 2-Error bars are deleted Mistyping MSI data (corrected) 3-the three parameters were suggested to give stronger discussion. 4- Both are the same now. 5- We illustrated that NSi was more



SDI Review Form 1.6

	tables and figures. 5- In the results and discussion sections, the author (s) should focus on the variations between the effect of Si and NSi in ameliorating the drastic effect of salt stress.	effective in translocation and deposition on leaves than Si.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		