



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_48922
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing between germination percentage in Moringa peregrina and Moringa oleifera under laboratory conditions.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>This Journal article is scientifically robust and technically sound. The Title, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and methods, Results and Discussion, 2 Tables, 2 Figures, 6 Plates, Conclusion and References are all of acceptable standards. However, some modifications and corrections could be done to upgrade the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> References within the body of the text and at the end of the write up could be put in the acceptable formats as outlined in the author's guide for this Journal. Current Journal papers of this Journal(Asian Plant Res. J.) could also be referred to. References within the body of the text need to be in numbered square box as [1] or [1, 2]. No sub-heading as Review is used in the Journal papers, as such the information deemed necessary in the 'Review' could be included under the Introduction, Materials and Methods, and Discussion.as found appropriate. Some of the Figures could be changed to Plates. The Figure on Germination curve has a lot of un-explained numbers and could be re-drawn clearer if possible. 	<p>Thanks for you</p> <p>I am done from corrected your comments.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Amendments could be made as follows -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lines 2- 3: Topic could be put as – Comparism between Germination Percentage in Moringa peregrina and Moringa oleifera under Laboratory Conditions Lines 7-8: Could be - ABSTRACT <p>This study was carried out in</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lines 17 – 18: recorded higher values at the 20th, 25th and 30th days for M. peregrina than M. oleifera. The highest number of seeds were germinated and recorded at 20th day Lines 22-23: Highest values of germination percentages (80.33% and 65.33%) were recorded for M. peregrina and M. oleifera seeds at 30 days Keywords: Comparism, germination percentage, soaking, M. peregrina, M. oleifera. Line 33: 1. INTRODUCTION Lines 39-40: In India, the leaf extracts of Moringa was used as feed as it was believed Line 49: it possess biomass production, Line 54: medicinal (all the plant parts), Lines 60-61: this work, is comparing between germination percentages, radical length and vigor index in M. peregrine Line 85: Could be – Plate 1. Line 147: 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS Line 167: Plate 2. Line 170: each species Line 174: 18 to 22 0C). Line 176: 10 days of sowing seeds Line 178: 30 days after Line 180: germinated seeds Line 200: 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 	<p>I am done from corrected your comments.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>20. Between Lines 210 and 212: - Table 1. Days (D) Could be changed to – 10 days; 15 days (not 10+15 etc.); 20 days; 25 days; 30 days Could delete rows and columns on L.S.D. at 5% ; 1% S ; D; S x D</p> <p>21. Line 215: after 20 days/at 30 days for M. peregrina and M. oleifera,</p> <p>22. Between Lines 231 and 233: In the graph - Fig. 1. Germination curve for Could remove grid lines and dual numbers on the curves; Could label x axis as Days in germination (from 35; 30; 25; 20; 15; 10; 5; 0)</p> <p>23. Could change Figs. 4. To Plate 3; Fig. 5. To Plate 4; Fig. 6. To Plate 5 and Fig. 7. To Plate 6.</p> <p>24. In Line 295: Fig. 8 could be changed to Fig. 2.</p> <p>25. In Line 302: Table (2): Could be changed to Table 2. Mean values</p> <p>26. Could delete Fig. 9 and Fig. 10. As they are repetitions as in Table 2.</p> <p>27. Line 314: 4. CONCLUSION</p> <p>28. In Line 317: Could change 15th day of 'sown' time gave to - 15th day of soaking time gave</p> <p>29. Line 330: Could change to - final review of this study.</p> <p>30. Lines 335 to 428: Could check through the REFERENCES, re-number as appeared in text and put in this Journal's accepted format.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments More work is needed to upgrade this manuscript.</p>		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	