

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_115538
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Various pre-sowing treatments on germination and seedling performance of Bixa orellana L. at low seed moisture content
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:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The work could have importance for scientific community 2. The title is ok. 3. Abstract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background abstract section should be shot and concise, at least not more than two sentences. • The author did not mention the number of treatments (<i>T</i>) and replication (<i>r</i>) used, and whether or not a randomization (e.g., completely randomized <i>design</i> (CRD), etc.) is applied. The M&M should be briefly pointed out in the abstract. • The language (grammar) across the whole manuscript should be revised. Some paragraphs are not clear, even in the abstract section. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is very shallow. Thus, some few paragraphs should be added. • The paragraph style should be consistent. For instance, I noted the second paragraph is indented with special "first line". • Lack of proper citation for scientific reports (e.g., <i>Most of the studies on germination were conducted at high seed moisture content i.e. above 40 %.</i>). The source of this statement should be acknowledged. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author should show the map of seed collection areas, in addition to mentioning the GPS points from which the seed were procured. • The study did not show how the moisture content (MC) of <i>Bixa orellana</i> was maintained to 10%, only explained how the MC was calculated. Because the focus of the study is to evaluate the seed germination of <i>Bixa orellana</i> under different pre-sowing treatments at 10% MC. • Under sub-section "Germination tests", the types of treatment used are not supported with relevant references. What new treatment incorporated in the current study is not indicated. • Only three seed germination parameters are not enough (MDG, peak value and seed vigor index). I recommend the author to include germination index (GI). <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure2 &3 need to properly pixelated (the margins are not proportional) so that would be clearly visible. • Section 3.1 "Morphological parameters and moisture content" should be moved to M&M section including both Figure 2 &3. • The caption of Table 1 should be edited. Indicate whether or not, e.g., 36±5.65 meant for mean and standard deviation (SD) or standard error (SE). • No need to put three level numbering or sub-sections (e.g., 3.2.1, etc.). Two sub-sections are enough for this study. Thus, Table 1 should be moved down. • The results and discussion lacks proper comparison of the results and discussion with respect to previous studies of the seed germination of <i>Bixa orellana</i>. • The size and style of heading and subheading should be consistent. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the language • Provide conclusion on the results or contents and importance of the study. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>5. The manuscript lack coherence and flow of ideas.</p> <p>6. The reference numbers are acceptable. But, should cross-check with the main text (body) section.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language needs major revision. I noticed many problems in the language structure of this manuscript.	
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:	Mohammed Adefa Seid
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Forestry Development , Ethiopia