

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_125253
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of <i>Acacia auriculiformis</i> 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 title " Optimization of <i>Acacia auriculiformis</i> A. Cunn. Ex Benth. seed germination by pretreatment is representative , but I would suggest maybe 'using' would be more appropriate than 'by'. In the abstract, the purpose (aim of the work) is clearly identified, which is important in my opinion. The study is complex and quite well organized, a fact that shows the correct and detailed documentation of the authors. Table 1 shows the results of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), think it's ANOVA. Figure one and two I wouldn't call them histograms, because a histogram has no breaks, being used for a continuous series of data and for figure 3 , I think it was more appropriate to apply TWO WAY ANOVA, using upper and lower case letters. I also recommend to make a short linguistic check.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Irina M. Morar
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania