

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
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 <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 study's findings provide a viable pathway to improve <i>Pterocarpus erinaceus</i> seedling production, which is essential for combating illegal exploitation through restoration efforts. This optimized germination technique could support reforestation, allowing faster replenishment of populations and enhancing local ecological and economic sustainability. These outcomes may have broader applications in West African reforestation initiatives, potentially providing a framework for other valuable but endangered native species.	
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.	The abstract is well-organized and features a clear structure that effectively guides the reader through its main points. Each section is distinctly outlined, making it easy to understand the overall message and purpose of the work presented.	
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.	The study employed a rigorous experimental design and statistical analysis to evaluate optimal germination and growth conditions for <i>Pterocarpus erinaceus</i> seedlings. The combination of varied pretreatments, substrates, and environments under a randomized block design ensures a robust assessment of the conditions affecting seed germination and seedling development. Moreover, the controlled tunnel microclimate vs. natural shade conditions provides insights into how controlled environments could accelerate germination, essential for restoration and propagation efforts. Statistical rigor through normality testing and appropriate test selection (ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis) improves the reliability of results and their applicability for practical nursery recommendations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, there are only minor mistakes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	My suggestions and comments have been integrated into the manuscript. The following comments were expressed: This sentence lacks clarity. I suggest rewriting it for better understanding. (page 3) I suggest starting this section with the presentation of experimental results followed by those of statistical analysis. (section 3.1) Unit of measurement? Days? (table 1) Please provide the standard deviation. (table 1 and table 2) In the manuscript, some minor corrections have been made to the English language.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihaela Rosca
Department, University & Country	“Ion Ionescu de la Brad” Iasi University of Life Sciences, Romania