

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_111817
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Seed Priming and Growing Media on Bitter Gourd Germination and Seedling Growth
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community 2. The article title is suitable 3. The abstract is clear, but the methods used are not appropriate 4. The subsections and the manuscript structure are appropriate 5. The manuscript lacks more information, especially in material and methods, the growth conditions are not mentioned and the soil materials are not characterized making the work poor 6. The methods used in this work need references <p>The subject appeared interesting, on the other hand, more details should be added especially in the material and methods part. The study of the effect of several factors on seed germination and seedling growth has been done by classical methods. It is more suitable to use an experimental study like a factorial plan analysis that can give high value to the work. Also, the analysis of the results by PCA (Principle compounds Analysis) could improve the study. The discussion is poor, the author has discussed only the highest and lowest values, and however, he worked on 16 experimentations. Statistical analysis is not well presented. All tables are inadequately presented.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Many linguistic errors call for a revision of the English language</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raja Jarboui
Department, University & Country	Jouf University, Saudi Arabia