

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125620
Title of the Manuscript:	Seed Morphology and Tetrazolium Quick Seed Viability Test of Malabar Neem (<i>Melia dubia</i> Cav.) under Laboratory Condition
Type of the Article	

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.	Although <i>Melia dubia</i> seeds viability was assessed by Suresh and Devakumar in 2017 with tetrazolium, the present investigation tries to evaluate the efficacy of different tetrazolium concentration on seed viability. This study is significant because <i>M. dubia</i> is a multipurpose tree and standardization of quick seed viability test is needed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable for the manuscript	
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.	<p>Could have been much more concise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Try to avoid detailed lists of applications as well as the distribution of species. - The temperature mentioned in experimental detail is 30, while in abstract it is 25. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Could have been improved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract, Introduction, Materials and methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgement, Competing interests, References - Need improvement in subsections and structure - Better to split sections of results and discussion 	
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.	<p>The materials and methods section has to be improved with standard references. There is a lack of clarity in the methods adopted and results observed. The selection of species and the research problem is commendable.</p> <p>Major comments listed below</p> <p>I. Introduction section :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has to be more concise. Try to focus on the matters related to fruit/seed morphology and viability. 2. Plant description is not much wanted. <p>II. Experimental details section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Try to include seed extraction procedure, depulping, surface sterilization, drying etc. with support of reference 2. Add latitude and longitude details 3. Photo with scale is preferable 4. Drupe is a type of fruit category, so is it required to include dimensions of fruit and drupe separately? 5. Mention specification of instruments 6. Standard color charts are available for verification 7. Before the Tetrazolium test, seeds have to be pre-soaked in distilled water for 24 hours 8. As mentioned, the non-viable seeds in the picture (Fig 4) possess seed coat. Requiring clarification regarding which parts of seed have been used for the viability test. Staining topography also seems to be different. <p>III. Results and Discussion section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's better to split qualitative and quantitative data separately (Table 2) 2. Try to add exact scientific terminology for to depicting the surface morphology of seeds 	

Review Form 3

	(Table 3) 3. To avoid repetition , prefer either graph (fig 5) or table (table6.) 4. Should strengthens the discussion part with supporting references	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes Additional reference – ISTA 1999,	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is a scope for correction of language in manuscript	
Optional/General comments	The tetrazolium test results could be connected with germination percentage.	

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:	Prajith T. M
Department, University & Country	Sreekrishna College, University of Calicut, India