

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 review is of great interest to the scientific community as it addresses in depth aspects related to the causes of dormancy and ways to manipulate them, especially in medicinal plants, but it can also be useful for those who need information about dormancy in other crops.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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	
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.	As mentioned, the review was scientifically robust and was very detailed and deserves to be published, however I think the CONCLUSION does not follow the standard of the text and needs to be rewritten in greater depth, taking advantage of what the author reviewed and described in the various items.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes The literature was well used by the author in the review. But the author needs to carry out a review as several citations appear in the TEXT but not in the REFERENCES. The author also needs to correct many scientific names in cultures, especially in REFERENCES, as the italics were missing.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>On page 5, Morpho Physiological dormancy was not included among the five main classes of dormancy.</p> <p>On page 10 the author ends by explaining: There are eight recognized levels. These levels need to be explored further.</p> <p>On page 16, it is missing: water (100 ????)</p> <p>In table 4 instead of immediety it should be immediately</p> <p>In the text the author writes PRECHILLING, pre-chilling or pre chilling. It should be standardized</p> <p>In table 10 the unit is missing (Degrees Centigrade???)</p>	

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:	Augusto Tulmann Neto
Department, University & Country	Sao Paulo State University, Brazil