

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_124460
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of seed dormancy and after ripening mechanism on seed germination – A Comprehensive review
Type of the Article	Review 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.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of seed dormancy and after-ripening mechanisms, which are crucial for understanding seed germination processes. It integrates physiological, biochemical, and molecular perspectives, making it highly relevant for both basic plant biology and applied agricultural sciences. The topic is significant as it directly impacts crop production and seed storage practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is generally appropriate. However, it could be slightly modified for clarity: "Seed Dormancy and After-Ripening Mechanisms in Seed Germination: A Comprehensive Review."	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but could be improved by emphasizing the practical implications of after-ripening in agriculture and seed management. This would make it more appealing to a broader audience, including practitioners.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections that logically flow from the introduction to the conclusions. However, the addition of more subheadings in lengthy sections could improve readability.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting up-to-date research findings and integrating various aspects of seed dormancy and after-ripening. The discussions are well-supported by recent references, which adds to its credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. No additional references are necessary, but a few more citations from the past five years could further enhance the manuscript's relevance.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though some sentences are complex and could benefit from simplification for clarity.	
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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Johana Delgado
Department, University & Country	UCAB, Venezuela