

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_125253
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Acacia auriculiformis A. Cunn. Ex Benth. seed germination by pretreatment analysis
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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important for the scientific community, to take advantage of some techniques to improve the germination of some seeds that may be exposed to inappropriate environmental conditions during the period of natural germination	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Using the Pretreatment Analysis to Optimize Seed Germination of <i>Acacia auriculiformis</i> A. Cunn. Ex	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes except Materials and methods and the table in Results Heading have been rearranged with the addition and deletion of some sentences, In addition deleted the ANOVA table in Results	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because, the researcher used different techniques to increase the germination percentage, which allows diversity in testing the best methods	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eltayeb Ahmed Hamad Suliman
Department, University & Country	Sudan