Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRB_110714**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Boron toxicity induced oxidative stress, ultrastructural and elemental composition changes and association of Fe-SOD with Boron tolerance in rice seedlings**
Type of the Article	

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 1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1, Yes, it is well detailed and has good** **2. The title is okay and aligns with the findings.** **3. The abstract is nicely written and justifies the work.** **4. I think it is important to have some parts of the results displayed immediately after each description either in tables or chats and have other info as appendix. This helps the reviewer reconcile the result with the description without having to scroll up and down.** **5. Some of the methods were not fully expressed as that of "Determination of antioxidative enzyme activities", and the title should read this way, these will help reduce word repetitions.** 7. **The methodologies need to reflect the original initiators of those methods; however, the author can mention the author who cited them recently if they did modify the initial methods. Example, "(Srivastava et al., 2014)", cited in most sections of the methods were not the originator of the methods neither did they modified the methods of Allen et al. (1986) and Weatherley (1950) they adopted. So, it could read this way: The modified method of Weatherley (1950) as employed by Srivastava et al., 2014 was used…….** 8. **The bar chart set of data would have been well presented using a pie chat which reveals percentage, since the author is making reference to percentile decline regarding treatment across different concentrations.**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Well detailed, paraphrased and cited.	

Review Form 1.7

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Prince Ozioma Emmanuel**
Department, University & Country	**Texas Tech University, United State, Federal University Wukari, Nigeria**