



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_45441
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of methyl jasmonate and ethephon exogenous application on phenolic compounds accumulation in cotton [Gossypium hirsutum L. (Malvaceae)]
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>)

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 manuscript entitled "Effect of methyl jasmonate and ethephon exogenous application on phenolic compounds accumulation in cotton [Gossypium hirsutum L. (Malvaceae)]" describes the effect of MeJA and ethephon treatments (alone and in combination) on phenolic metabolite synthesis. The manuscript is poorly written, the introduction almost does not provide scientific background for the study conducted by the researchers. The work may attract more interest if additional experiments were performed, like testing the plants resistance after the treatments or using inhibitors of MeJA, EtOH and checking for the results for comparison. Even though there are a number of results on cotton phenolics after MeJA or ethephon treatments, the Authors dodge from divagations in the Discussion section and instead they evoke the results and the whole section is more a conclusion than a real discussion.	We conducted this study to test the ability of methyljasmonate and ethephon to induce the biosynthesis of phenolic compounds in cotton. We thank you for this observation because indeed we have research in progress to test the effectiveness conferred by these two molecules to plants by pathogen inoculations.
Minor REVISION comments	How were the concentrations of MeJA and ethephon cherry-picked? What were the final concentrations of ethanol in MeJA and ethephon solutions, and why was not ethanol included in the solvent used for the control spraying? Why was not the whole phenolics assayed in the same extract as was used for UPLC analysis, and why were the individual phenolic compounds not quantified? In statistical analysis what was the post-hoc test used? The description of Fig. 1 lacks identification of a, b, c and d and in the y axis description French "de" was not removed. The language needs improvement.	The same extract was not used for HPLC identification and the individual phenolics were not quantified because we did this study in previous work. The post hoc test used was the Newman-keul test at the 5% threshold.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	