

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126316
Title of the Manuscript:	Improvement of seed germination and seedling growth of African rosewood ( <i>Pterocarpus erinaceus</i> Poir) by seed pretreatment, seedling substrate and growing medium
Type of the 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 (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.	<i>Pterocarpus erinaceus</i> , a highly valuable endemic species. The present study with regard to increase the germination percentage in nursery is good study valuable for conservation of Biodiversity.	Ok
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Ok
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	Ok
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Ok
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.	Low natural germination rate of <i>Pterocarpus erinaceus</i> is main obstacle for conserving and perpetuating this species which is already facing extinction and over exploitation. Present article about increasing the germination percentage is good attempt to preserve this Plant.	Ok
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	Ok
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	Ok
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	