



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43650
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIOXIDANT CAPACITY IN LEAF AND ROOT TISSUES OF PRUNUS SPP. UNDER FLOODING
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 presents interesting results regarding the effect of flooding on the antioxidant capacity of trees of important value as fruit production. Although it is well written, it is necessary to make some changes in the text so that it can be published, as indicated below. TITLE Remove the dot after spp ABSTRACT Line 12: ... was quantified through the leaves of Replace by: was evaluated by measuring lipid peroxidation Line 14-16: As results, ... Replace by: Under stress conditions, ... were observed. INTRODUCTION Line 30: ... using stones of scion cultivars ... Replace by: ... using cultivar scions obtained from ... Line 37: ... for stone ... Line 61-64: The plums environmental conditions. This sentence is quite long. I suggest to rewrite it. Line 67: Since the information about <i>Prunus</i> ... Lack of information in the literature? Line 88: ... enzymes activity. MATERIAL AND METHODS Line 102-104: Which statistical test was used? RESULTS Line 109: ... a long With Line 116-118: Figure Caption - (right column) grown under flooding conditions. Values are mean of three replicates. <u>Change in all figure captions.</u> It would be very useful for the reader to add in the figure the letters in their respective histograms as the results of statistic tests.	We cordially thank you for reading the paper and for the considerations made by the reviewer. To be sure, they have been read with appreciation and reviewed some points that could really be modified. The considerations were accepted by the authors and all the corrections were highlighted in yellow colour.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	DISCUSSION Line 175-176: This situation in this study. This sentence is not clear. Line 181: ... cultivar will be variable Replace by: cultivar varies depending Line 210-211: Join the paragraphs since the sentence in the line 211 is related to the previous one. REFERENCES Please, check al the refences. There are some errors such as lack of italic in scientific names, etc.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	