

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEE_121876</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluating seed viability and germination enhancement through plant growth hormones in <i>Anogeissus latifolia</i> (Roxb. ex DC.) Wall. Ex Guill. &amp; Perr.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

[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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Plant of <i>Anogeissus latifolia</i> helps in erosion control as it is a good survivor on eroded land therefore used in river bank stabilization (Nag et al, 2007). It improves soil as it contributes to soil nutrient cycling, exhibiting high leaf-litter decomposition rates. As this species is slow-growing and has low seed viability and germination rates, this makes the surviving established seedlings difficult to thrive in the wild. So enhancing their germination through homons application, this study will not only contribute to the long-term survival of <i>A. latifolia</i>, but also to environmental conservation and protection against global warming.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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>	<p>Yes, no addition nor delection</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p><b>Some subsections and structure are inappropriate:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>In the introduction</b>, the author should first mention, among other problems encountered with this plant species, the germination problem, which can only be improved by the use of phytohormones. This would clearly highlight the problem, which can be solved by the use of hormones; hence the aim of this study.</li> <li>- <b>Seed viability assessment:</b> in this section, author should first describe seed pre-treatment by soaking in distilled water before describing the Tetrazolium test experiment</li> <li>- <b>Result and discussion:</b> Tables 2 and 3 are superfluous and therefore unnecessary. In addition, the number of decimal places is too high, which means that overall the results are not properly analysed in order to highlight the effects of the different modalities of each of the two factors: both types of hormones on one hand and their concentrations on the other. Tables contain unnecessary information (minimum, maximum, standard error, standard deviation) at once! This makes them unwieldy, and the author does not use all these values for analysis. Worse still, there is no discussion of these results in comparison with anyone else's work, despite announcing that he would present both the results and their discussion.</li> </ul>	
<p>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>	<p>This manuscript would be scientific if the author had properly presented and discussed his results, comparing them with those of other authors. Or he should have separated the results from the discussion, and this is what I think I saw. In that case, <b>the discussion is missing</b>, and I don't see it anywhere in this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Globally acceptable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally all the experiments were scientifically well conducted. But the manuscript is affected by serious structural errors in the presentation of the statistical variables in the tables, in the insufficiency or inadequacy of these tables and, above all, the total absence of any discussion	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Koffi Bertin Yao</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universite Nangui Abrogoua, Cote d'Ivoire</b>