



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39857
Title of the Manuscript:	Proteomic analysis reveals proteins that are differentially accumulated in leaves banana normais e "giant plant".
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	The submitted manuscript aimed to analyse the protein changes in normal and giant banana plants. The generated data may be useful for future biomarker development. Major concerns or improvements should be on the following: Extensive linguistic (English) corrections are desirable. The submitted version has numerous common, punctuation, tense, grammatical, sentence framing/ phrase construction issues which should be taken care by professional language editing or native English speaking scientific colleagues/ collaborators to amend the article to necessary extent. Some texts are in Brazilian language. The discussion should be more organised. Authors should discuss the identified proteins based on their function/category and in the same paragraph for the same function. Minor concerns: Introduction: P1, L36: Banana cultivation....most important agricultural practices, with more than 125 producing countries? What is the most important agricultural practices? Are authors referring to "banana is one of the most cultivated fruit crops in more than 125 countries"? P1, L38: Brazil cultivates.... I don't think "Brazil" can cultivate banana, it should be human who cultivate the banana. P2, L41: Authors should highlight the current problems for conventional propagation method before introducing plant micropropagation as a potential solution. P2, L45: What is the percentage of somaclonal variation in tissue cultured bananas, for example gigantism? P2. L50: How severe of this giant plant to the economy losses? P2, L57: Delete "Different molecular markers.....results" P2, L58: Authors should describe the importance of analysing at the protein level. Protein is the gene product. P2, L66: "...by employing 2-DE trypsin" change to "...by employing 2-DE and mass spectrometry" P2, L69: Please insert reference. P2, L69-70: Delete repetitive sentence. P2, L73: "...on banana leafs" change to "...on banana leaves" P2, L74: "two-dimensional electrophoresis" change to "two-dimensional gel electrophoresis" Materials and Methods P3, L78: Should be "Materials and Methods". P3, 81: It would be great if authors could provide pictures for normal and giant banana. P3, L83: From which in vitro propagation method? Please insert reference	Ok. Ok. * Line 36 * Brazil produces more than... line 38 * line 44 * line 47. No official information about gigantism. Private companies report the occurrence of 15% of micropropagated seedlings with gigantism. * There is still no official data reporting that involving economic losses with somaclonal variation, only for losses related to <i>viruses and fungal diseases</i>. OK Line 67 Ok. Line 77 Ok. Line 80 Ok Ok. Line 83 Ok. Line 93 Ok. Line 100. The propagation methods belong to private company.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	P3, L86: "from leaves" Is it from young or mature leaves? From which sample, normal and giant or just normal plant? P3, L92: "submitted to a secong clarifying" please rephrase P3, L100 & 101: "two-dimensional electrophoresis" change to "two-dimensional gel electrophoresis" P3, L114: "high molecular weight" change to "high molecular weight protein marker" P3, L114: "were used" change to "was used" P4, L128: "significant and reproducible changes" What are meaning of the "significant change"? Is it by fold change? P4, L139: "0,5 h" is it 30 min? Results and Discussion Figure 1: Which sample was this? Normal or giant? Why authors need to run SDS-PAGE since you have a better analysis, i.e. 2-DE, and you're not intended to optimise the extraction protocol? Where is the protein marker? Figure 1 caption: "Protein profile of proteins extracted in gel SDS-PAGE...." change to "Protein profile of leaf samples detected on SDS-PAGE gels..." Delete "each" and replace "weel" to "well" Figure 2: Protein marker? P6, L187: "were identified" change to "were detected" P6, L187-188: "Of all identified spots" change to Of these" P6, L194: Delete "metabolism pathway for obtaining" P6, L194: "energy" change to "energy metabolism" P7, L197: "Tabela 1" change to "Table 1" Table 1: Suggest authors to group the identified proteins based on their category, i.e. the first few proteins are "energy metabolism", or "stress response protein", etc. P9, L207, 210, 211: "Rubisc" should be "Rubisco" P9, L223: "these enzyme" Which enzymes authors referring to? P10, L252: "not effect" change to "not affect" P10, L259-267: This paragraph should be at the first paragraph of the discussion as this was the main finding. Should not be "glutamine synthetase"? P10, L264: "This findings shows" change to "These findings show" P11, L268: "Recent papers related growth phenotype increase...." Please rephrase for the whole paragraph.	Ok. Both. Foliage leaves from normal and Giant plant Ok. Line 125 & 126 Line 139 Line 140 Yes. Ok. (... for 30 minutes.) Line 165 The protocol used was developed for <i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i> seeds. Therefore the need to evaluate in our samples before starting the two-dimensional gel electrophoresis. Please see line 110. Ok. Ok Line 216 Line 216 Ok Ok Ok ok Ok "Besides Rubisco, there are also gliceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase, fructose 1,6-bisfosfato aldolase and triose-phosphate isomerase..." Ok. Line 313 Yes. Line 256 Line 260
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		We appreciate your review. Your comments were relevant and all suggestions were accepted.