

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117160
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of seed testing protocol and seed germination improvement treatment in Henna (<i>Lawsonia inermis</i> Linn.)
Type of the 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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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><u>Compulsory</u> 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. Henna is an important plant used widely in various ways. Sustainable henna production depends on the availability of good quality seeds to meet the growing demands.</p> <p>2. I would suggest to change the article title to "Enhancing the germination of Henna (<i>Lawsonia inermis</i>) seeds through various pre-treatment techniques"</p> <p>3. I would suggest to rewrite the abstract as many complicated and confusing words are being used in this section</p> <p>4. I suggest the authors to check the word's structure used in the manuscript and change accordingly</p> <p>5. The manuscript is not scientifically proved as the experimental design used in the experiment have not been mentioned</p> <p>6. NA</p> <p>1. I would suggest to rewrite the key words precisely.</p> <p>2. There are grammatical and sentence structure errors throughout the manuscript. This makes reading the manuscript quite unpleasant. I would suggest the authors to seek the help of an English language editor before resubmitting.</p> <p>3. Henna variety or cultivar used for experiment is not mentioned in the manuscript. Likewise, statistical methods and experimental design employed in the research work have not been explained.</p> <p>4. In the introduction, the aim or objectives of this study needs to be justified clearly.</p> <p>5. The methodology of the research paper in section 2.1 do not clearly describe the details of optimal moisture content for drying of cleaned seeds.</p> <p>6. The calculation of germination per cent has not been described in your methodology section 2.1.2.1</p> <p>7. The speed of germination as mentioned in Table No.1 are not well explained.</p> <p>8. The authors have mentioned in methodology section 2.2 about the breaking of seed dormancy with different treatments. However, in results the outcome of these treatments are not been described. This can confuse the reader and make the meaning of the sentences unclear as that mentioned in result and discussion (section 3.2). The control treatment mentioned in this section</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	have also not been explained. I would suggest you to rewrite the section 3.2 precisely. 9. The results of the study do not match with methodology. Please elaborate the methodology according to the results. 10. The depth and merit of the discussion is very poor.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammatical and sentence structure errors are noticed in the manuscript and the necessary corrections are to be done	
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:	Star Luikham
Department, University & Country	Manipur University, India