



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>Good paper fit for publication by APRJ. However, more amendments need to be integrated in the paper before it is considered for publication.</p> <p>Too few authors cited at the level of the Introduction.</p> <p>Location of the study area needs to be integrated at the level of materials and methods. The geographical coordinates of the study area (latitude and longitude) should be highlighted.</p> <p>Equally, the materials and methods section should be divided into sub-sections as follows: location of study area; data collection procedure; and data analysis procedure. It is imperative to state the statistical software used for data analysis.</p> <p>Results of the study are too descriptive. Effort should be made to integrate inferential statistics in order to give the findings more depth and scientific rigour.</p> <p>The results and discussion section should be divided into sub-sections following the specific objectives of the study. This will go a long way to ease comprehension. In addition, the discussion of the paper's findings should be done properly i.e. comparing and contrasting the findings of the paper with the findings of other authors. More recent scientific publications (2014 – 2019) should be sought for and used in discussing the findings of the paper.</p> <p>A fitting conclusion should be given for the paper and the practical and policy implications of the study highlighted.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Language and syntax should be looked into.	
Optional/General comments	Good paper fit for publication by APRJ. However, the afore-cited points should be critically looked into before the paper is considered for publication.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nyong Princely Awazi
Department, University & Country	University of Dschang, Cameroon