

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_127672
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable techniques for overcoming seed dormancy in Flamboyant
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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>
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.	This study explores strategies to overcome seed dormancy in <i>Delonix regia</i> , a species valued for its ornamental, ecological, and reforestation benefits. It highlights the use of sustainable, environmentally friendly methods like heat treatments instead of chemical scarification, offering practical solutions for large-scale applications. By prioritizing eco-conscious approaches, the research addresses the growing need for biodiversity conservation and sustainable reforestation, making its findings particularly pertinent to the agricultural and scientific communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, " Sustainable techniques for overcoming seed dormancy in Flamboyant ", is concise and accurately reflects the study's objective of evaluating sustainable methods for breaking seed dormancy in <i>Delonix regia</i>	
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.	The abstract is thorough and systematically organized, effectively capturing the objectives, methods, findings, and conclusions of the study. However, a few refinements could improve its clarity: - Suggested inclusions: Briefly includes the statistical methods employed (e.g., ANOVA, Tukey test) to emphasize the study's methodological robustness. - Suggested exclusions: Streamline the phrase "highlighting its potential as a sustainable and efficient alternative to chemical treatments" to focus more directly on the primary findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound due to its robust experimental design with appropriate replication and diverse treatments to test dormancy-breaking techniques. Standardized methods and rigorous statistical analyses, such as ANOVA and Tukey tests, ensure the reliability of the results. The study demonstrates that heat treatment at 80°C for 5 minutes significantly enhances germination rates, highlighting its effectiveness and ecological relevance. The findings are well-grounded in literature and interpreted accurately within the context of previous studies. Overall, the research provides reliable and valuable contributions to scientific knowledge.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and include relevant foundational and recent studies	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The text is appropriate for academic communication but could be refined slightly to improve its readability and flow: a. Sentence Structure: Certain sentences in the introduction and results sections are excessively lengthy and complex, which might hinder understanding. Simplifying them into shorter, more concise sentences would enhance clarity. b. Grammar and Formatting: Minor errors, such as inconsistent capitalization in headings (e.g., "material and methods" versus "Material and Methods"), should be standardized for consistency.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures and Tables: Figures are clear and well-labeled, but some would benefit from more detailed captions to ensure standalone comprehension. • Experimental Design: The study design is robust, but additional variables (e.g., seed viability tests before treatment) could strengthen the findings. • Sustainability Implications: The ecological significance of heat treatments is well-addressed, but these techniques' potential scalability and economic feasibility could be discussed further. • Formatting: Ensure uniform formatting of section titles and references to improve professionalism. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pragalbh Tiwari
Department, University & Country	College of Forestry (CoF), Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences (SHUATS), India