

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.	The manuscript addresses the use of scarification treatments on physically dormant seeds of Flamboyant. It is essential to overcome seed dormancy prior to sowing if rapid germination is to be achieved. This manuscript establishes a scarification treatment using hot water at 80°C for 5 minutes, which represents an alternative to the use of sulfuric acid.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I do not consider the title of the article to be adequate. We propose that "Sustainable techniques to overcome seed dormancy in Flamboyant (Delonix regia)" be used.	
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 must complete the species with the classifier. In addition, the "Study Design" section must be more complete and clearly explain the design used; elements that were placed in the "Methodology" section can be used. In this "Methodology" section, it must be explained how the experiment was carried out. The "Conclusion" section must be more precise and show the true result achieved with the research.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, based on experimentation based on scarification protocols widely used in the literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	For the scope of the research, we consider that the references are correct, current and appropriate to the research topic.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	They are adequate, the document is scientifically understandable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The "Materials and Methods" section should be reviewed and corrected to achieve a better understanding of the experimental design and the determinations made. In the "Results and Discussion" section, we consider the information in Table 1 unnecessary; it can be eliminated. The "Conclusions" section should be more precise and show the true result achieved with the investigation; we suggest rewriting it again.	

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:	Yanier Acosta Fernández
Department, University & Country	Bioplantas Centre, University of Ciego de Ávila, Cuba