

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_82629
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSIOLOGICAL RESPONSES OF MAIZE (Zea mays L.) TO COPPER (Cu) INDUCED STRESS
Type of the 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:

(<https://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/editorial-policy>)

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	<div>❑ Although the topic is interesting, it has some shortcomings with respect to the methods of analysis and the representation of results; which results in poor discussion. In materials and methods, it does not specify the experimental design used or the number of repetitions. In addition, the use of a variance analysis and multiple comparison tests is mentioned; however, in results it is limited to the representation of bar graphs with standard deviations per treatment, without showing the statistical differences by any mean test</div> <div>❑ The authors assume that as copper concentrations are higher, maize productivity decreases, which seems evident according to the results; however, it is suggested to use some statistical evidence to verify such a finding, it is suggested to use the Pearson correlation or Principal Component Analysis.</div>	
Minor REVISION comments	<div>Title: The audience of the manuscript is the international community; it is convenient to add the country.</div> <div>❑ Materials and methods: Study area: It is recommended to add cartography so that the reader can spatially locate the place where the research was developed.</div>	
Optional/General comments	<div>❑ In my opinion, although the work is interesting and well structured, the deficiency of the statistical methods to validate the differences between treatments is a limitation to accept the work in the journal. It is suggested that authors develop statistical evidence to give greater scientific validity to their findings, before being published in the journal</div>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Alberto Santillán Fernández
Department, University & Country	Colegio de Postgraduados campus Campeche, México