

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_87694
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Pre-sowing Seed Treatments on Physiological Potential of Seed Germination in Okra
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors had mentioned that they had taken final count at 10days. But, in case of okra final count is 21 days. Justify it.</p> <p>Material and Method: should be rewritten by mentioning all the treatments. Appropriate method is not followed.</p> <p>Statistical Analysis: Not Mention</p> <p>Results and discussion: should be rewrite</p> <p>Tables: see the comments</p> <p>Conclusion: Rewrite according to comments</p> <p>With the above observations, I suggest that the manuscript may be accepted after incorporate all the points.</p>	<p>The rate of germination is strongly associated with temperature. In our conditions seed germination was terminated up to day 10th. That is why day 10th was considered as the day of final count. I think the day 21st may be considered for final count in case of field study.</p> <p>Attempts have been made to clarify the issues related to materials and method by redrafting this part.</p> <p>Needful has been done</p> <p>Re-written, and attempts have been made to improve results and discussion part</p> <p>Efforts have been made to improve the overall standard of the manuscript by incorporating all the suggestions made by the respected reviewer.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	See the attached for comments	<p>S1 Abstract has been modified</p> <p>S2 Needful done</p> <p>S3 Necessary correction is made</p> <p>S4 In fact there was an error in writing. In fact 200 seeds were taken each for simple soaking and priming separately</p> <p>S5 Already commented above</p> <p>S6 Already commented above</p> <p>S7 Needful done</p> <p>S8 Modified accordingly</p> <p>S9-12 Clarified in the material and method.</p> <p>In fact T1, T2, T3 and T4 are simple seed soaking for a specified period and tested for germination potential while T5, T6, T7 and T8 are seed priming wherein after soaking of seed s for specified period of time , they were dried back to original moisture content and then tested for germination potential</p> <p>S13 AvS is the average of simple soaking treatments (T1-T4) while AvP is the average of priming treatments (T5-T8)</p>
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	There is no ethical issue regarding this manuscript