

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116790
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of light and GA3 on germination of Purple Passion Fruit (<i>Passiflora edulis</i> Sims) seeds
Type of the Article	Research Article

[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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important as it provides valuable insights into optimizing seed germination and seedling growth of purple passion fruit through the use of light and GA3, which has practical implications for crop production and agricultural sustainability.</p> <p>?? The title of the article, "Effect of light and GA3 on the germination of purple passion fruit (<i>Passiflora edulis</i> Sims)", is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the study. However, if you're looking for a slightly more concise option: Alternative title suggestion: "Optimizing purple passion fruit germination with light and GA3".</p> <p>?? Some Issues: Inclusion of methodology: The abstract should focus more on summarizing the key findings rather than detailing the methodology. This will make it more concise and reader-friendly. Lack of clarity on significance: It's not clear from the abstract why the study is important or what implications the findings have for agriculture or horticulture.</p> <p>?? Suggestions for improvement: Clear Separation of Results and Discussion: The manuscript should clearly separate the results and discussion sections to avoid confusion. This will help readers distinguish between the presentation of data and the interpretation of results. Subheadings for Clarity: Use subheadings to clearly delineate different sections of the manuscript, such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. This will improve the overall structure and organization of the manuscript. Detailed Materials and Methods: Provide more detailed explanations of the experimental procedures in the Materials and Methods section. This will help readers understand how the study was conducted and ensure reproducibility.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of its methodology and reporting. The experimental design, including the treatments, replication, and statistical analysis, follows standard scientific practices. The results are presented with appropriate statistical analyses, and the conclusions drawn from the data are supported by the results obtained.</p> <p>6. -</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications. The article contains several grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistencies in terminology. It lacks the precision and clarity required for scholarly writing. By addressing these issues, the article's language quality can be improved to meet the standards of scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. While your study provides valuable insights into the germination of purple passion fruit seeds under different GA3 and light treatments, it would benefit from more references to supportive studies. 2. Study lacks supporting information on the specific mechanisms by which light influences germination. Including details on how light affects the physiological and biochemical processes involved in seed germination would enhance the depth of your study. 3. Incorporating supportive studies to each result section would enhance the credibility of your findings and provide a deeper understanding of the observed effects of different GA3 concentrations and light intensities on purple passion fruit seed germination. 4. In treatment T7, the time taken for 50% germination (31.30 days) is less than the time taken for the first germination (35.17 days). This is unusual. 5. The study lacks mention or support for the B:C (Benefit to Cost) ratio, which was stated as the highest in Treatment 8 (GA3 350 ppm + light 30,100 lux). Including an explanation or supporting data for this ratio would enhance the understanding of the economic implications of the treatments. 6. The references provided in the study lack consistency in format, and there are discrepancies in the years cited in some of the references.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mahamed Ashiq I</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Institute of Agri-Biotechnology, University of Agricultural Sciences, India</p>