

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_130700
Title of the Manuscript:	Osmopriming with Polyethylene Glycol (PEG-6000) improves the action of seed germination, growth, and physiology in carrot
Type of the Article	

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Osmopriming is a valuable tool for seed treatment. Osmopriming with Polyethylene Glycol (PEG-6000) improved the action of seed germination, growth, and physiology in an important crop carrot of India. The research work was nicely conducted in order to improve the germination and vigour using three carrot varieties viz. Carrot Florence (G <sub>1</sub> ), Deb Kuroda-1 (G <sub>2</sub> ), and Deb Kuroda-3 (G <sub>3</sub> ), and various concentrations and durations of PEG-6000, including 0.1 MPa for 24 hours (T <sub>2</sub> ), 0.1 MPa for 48 hours (T <sub>3</sub> ), 0.25 MPa for 24 hours (T <sub>4</sub> ), 0.25 MPa for 48 hours (T <sub>5</sub> ), 0.40 MPa for 24 hours (T <sub>6</sub> ), and 0.40 MPa for 48 hours (T <sub>7</sub> ), non-primed seeds (T <sub>1</sub> ).	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Suitable</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>comprehensive</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Correct: A more comprehensive and latest literature survey on subject manuscript required in <b>introduction</b> . Only one an old reference of Heydecker, 1973 was reported which is insufficient. <b>Materials and methods</b> . Number of replicate not mentioned.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes. However, [Heydecker 1973] cited in main text but reference is not available in reference list Ghiyasi et al., 2008; Sadeghi et al., 2011 (Incomplete-volume, issue and page number not available). Singh <i>et al.</i> , year of publication is missing.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>A nice research work. However, the introduction part is very weak. Only on an old reference of 1973 was cited.</b>	

#### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Shafiq</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Karachi, Pakistan</b>