



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45038
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH AND GAS EXCHANGES OF ARUGULA UNDER PHOSPHATE FERTILIZATION AS WATER STRESS ATTENUATOR
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	There is a suggestion to change the title of a paper, and do not use the word “attenuator”, because it is too strong and does not fit the obtained data. Main debate is about results and discussion part. First authors in methods part write, that F test was used for data analysis, but there is no data about that. Question is: was phosphorus statistically significant factor or not? About data presentation in figures. Usually, when we present means in scientific papers it goes together with standard errors, but this paper lacks it. In figure 1 there is presented letters “A” and “B”, what does it mean? If statistically significant difference, so between what cases? In figures 2 and 3 also I suggest present standard errors. It would help to make main conclusion about the effect of phosphorus on plants' physiological and growth indicators. Because now, we see only tendency according to the trends, but there is no information in figures about the significance of the effect of increasing P concentration and authors only write some examples about that in the text. In figure 2B there is no data of 50%Etr treatment variant. Why? Also, why in description of figure 2D there is written differently than in all the text. Better to write the same “instantaneous water use efficiency”, not “liquid photosynthesis”. In conclusions there should be mentioned not only tendency, but also should be answered the question - was the effect of increasing P concentration significant or not. And, can we use it as mitigator of the drought stress?	
Minor REVISION comments	There are no remarks for introduction. Material and methods part also well defined.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Irena Januskaitiene
Department, University & Country	Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania