



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_44843
Title of the Manuscript:	ANATOMICAL FEATURES OF SUGARCANE TREATED WITH THIAMINE
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	In this study, anatomical features of sugarcane treated with thiamine was studied. In the research, a completely randomized experiment was installed and designed in a double factorial scheme at 3x5 levels, in which the first factor consists of 3 different variety of sugarcane, the second factor was thiamine doses in five levels; fifteen treatments were made with five replications, 75 plots in total. As results it is claimed that tissues from the leaves and roots were influenced by exogenous action of thiamine as used at planting, displaying a positive response, doses above 400 mg L-1 can be a limiting factor to the development of these tissues. Among the varieties of sugarcane no significant difference was observed on the anatomy of leaves and roots. In conclusion, concentrations till 400 mg L-1 of thiamine, at exogenous administration, promoted a better development on morph-anatomic features of leaves and roots in planting of sugarcane seedlings.	There are no notes
Minor REVISION comments	There is no minor revision request on the manuscript.	There are no notes
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has valuable results on the use of macroalgae in agriculture sector. Moreover, the result of the manuscript is practicable.	There are no notes

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)	