



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_34567
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI-OXIDANT ENZYME ACTIVITY OF SUGARCANE (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L.) GENOTYPES FOR MOISTURE STRESS
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>)



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	The report compares levels of 2 enzymes involved in eliminating free radicals in 8 genotypes after 20 days of 'induced' drought. There are no soil moisture content values, no measure of free radical levels, no measure of effects on biomass or sugar production, etc. so it is just a comparison of the two enzymes. Consequently the claim that those genotypes with high values perform better in drought cannot be justified.	Thank you for review. The paper it self a postgraduate research work due to lack of time we did only comparison of two enzymes. Because of your comment we took some more time and did the relation between enzymes and relative water content.
Minor REVISION comments	There are statements made without references, claims made that are not substantiated, and editing needed. I have returned the ms with mark-ups and sticky notes pointing out problems.	I did the corrections suggested by you regarding references.
Optional/General comments		Thank you for your comments. It helps me to improve my paper strength and my knowledge.