SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_14109**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of silicon and nano-silicon on germination, growth and yield of faba bean (Vicia faba L.) under salt stress conditions**
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	**The interactive effect between salt stress and silicon (Si and NSi) on germination, growth and yield should take into account.** **Line 138 Why did Mg not determined?**	Mg and Ca are nearly similar in the bases of their physiological effect, movement in the plant and both are chemically equivalent, thus the author determined what he thought more important.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 8 at Study design: "were used" should change to "used". The "were" should be deleted. Line 100 "as ppm" should change to "mg/kg". Line 103 in the Table (1): "Ec(dsm^{-1})"should change to "ES (dSm^{-1})". Line 143 "18000×g" should change to "18000 *g*". Line 238 and 252 "reported by [40]"change to "reported by the name of author". Line 419, 420, 449 "K%" change to "K(%)or K"; line 431-434 "N%" change to "N(%)or N"; line 462 Na%. Line 466 "potassium: sodium ratio" and line 469, 481, 484" K:Na ratio " should change to "K/Na ratio"	All suggestions and corrections are made and highlighted with yellow.
Optional/General comments	The description of the paper was very good.	Thanks a lot. I appreciate your comment.