



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_34567
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI-OXIDANT ENZYME ACTIVITY OF SUGARCANE (Saccharum officinarum L.) GENOTYPES FOR MOISTURE STRESS
Type of the Article	Full 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 manuscript has many problems that to difficult its publication, However the worst one is the lack of statistical analysis who show the different moisture tolerance from the varieties Co 95020 and Co 87025 in comparetion to another's is really real. In this case, analysis such as Anova or Test t are essentials. Thus I do not recommend publication.	As per your comments we did the analysis part more strength with correlation. Because of some urgency we wrote very fastly. But after comments we took some time and write the paper as suggested by you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No comment about moisture stress is exploited in introduction. No citation about, only for dry stress. The unit : eu/100ml/gram fresh weight is unusual and difficultly comparable with any other publications. Misra and Fridovich (1972) and Chance and Meahley (1955) are very, very old references.	Actually in sugarcane regarding moisture stress and enzyme analysis lack of recent works. So we added maximum recent references now.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A better revision about the English language must be done.	We revised the paper as you suggested