

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123865
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING SEED DORMANCY IN MEDICINAL PLANTS – A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	Commercialising any plant has challenges. This paper tried to review different ways of breaking inherent dormancy in medicinal plants. The results should help in establishing these plants as commercial options, thus lessening the pressure on the ever declining natural world.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, but I believe the information is also important for other plants. Maybe: EXPLORING SEED DORMANCY, FOCUSSED ON MEDICINAL PLANTS – A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW	
<b>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.</b>	Yes	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, though some sections seemed more appropriate as sub-sections. See my comments in Track Changes.	
<b>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.</b>	No. Some parts are well written, others not. "Plants in the field have issues with seed quality". No, natural seed quality is a sum total of many ecological and physiological factors. Then KNO3 is called nitric acid! On cryo scarification the following; Proper aftercare, such as maintaining cleanliness and moisture, is crucial for minimizing scarring and promoting skin healing. Is the author talking about plant seeds here? In Table 6 alfalfa is called <i>Medicago radiata</i> . Yes, there is always confusion with common names, but surely alfalfa, or lucerne is <i>Medicago sativa</i> ? Some other common names and scientific names seemed not to add up. In the references not one single scientific name is written in the correct format. There is nothing wrong with using software to help compile a reference list (which is what I suspect happened here), but it is the author's responsibility to check the scientific correctness thereof. Then, from the section heading "Physical dormancy", there are odd dim lines in weird places, as if parts of the text (and tables) were copied and pasted...	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, but it is not in the required format. Please see my comments in track changes. Also, some of the statistics cited in the introduction is over 20 years old. I am sure many of those have changed in the meantime. Maybe look for more recent papers in this regard.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Overall yes, with a few exceptions. Please see my comments.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please see my comments and suggestions in the manuscript.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anélia Marais</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>South Africa</b>