



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_47671
Title of the Manuscript:	Overcoming dormancy and influence of light on the physiological quality of Senna cana seeds (Nees & Mart.) H.S. Irwin & Barneby
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Line 116 - In the imbibition treatment for 24 hours at environmental temperature and at 80 °C (T2 and T3, respectively) 2- Line 119 - physical dormancy 3- Line 120-121 - In relation to the imbibition in water at 80 °C (T5), it can be inferred that this probably caused the death of the embryo 4- Line 124 -129 - The highest percentages of final... 5- Line 130 – 134 - In <i>S. cana</i>, mechanical... 6- Line 135-138 - According to results observed in the ... 7- Line 139 – 146 - The highest value of IVG (Fig. 1C) was observed for... 8- Line 147 – 151 - According to [25], the lower the mean germination ti... 9- Line 152 – 155 - This fact corroborates with other studies found in the literature for... 10- Line 160- 165 - The physical dormancy prevents the water imbibition... 11- Line 175 – 178 - The best result for first germination count was observed for the... 12- Line 187 – 229 - 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- lineThe figure shows that treatments T2 and T5 do not differ statistically. T2 differs from T3. Correct. 2 Relate to some literature 3 Relate to some literature: Under conditions of abiotic stresses such as high temperatures, the production of species reactive oxygen species (ROS). EROs are reduced forms molecular oxygen, extremely reactive and may cause oxidative damage to various components cells, including chloroplasts, mitochondria, membrane plasma, peroxisomes, cell wall and apoplast. explain and discuss 4 Relate to some literature 5 literature lack 6 you are mixing conclusion with discussion. 7 the topic is results and discussion, you only do the descriptive analysis of the data without explaining the nature of the differences between the treatments, and there is something very common during the entire discussion, there is no scientific theoretical basis supporting their descriptions. 8 explain and discuss why 9 you reference. However, you again do not support your hypothesis with convincing arguments, directed to a plausible explanation. Showing that the results are observed in other works is not the same as explaining the phenomenon. 10 Read the book by Bewley and Black: Physiology and biochemistry of seed in relation to germination and physiology of development and germination. in works of germination it is obligatory to have this reference, mainly when it is tried to explain the nature of the dormancy. 11 again presents the results and leaves the discussion aside 12 again presents the results and leaves the discussion aside. is 	

- Comment [FA1]:** lineThe figure shows that treatments T2 and T5 do not differ statistically. T2 differs from T3. Correct.
- Comment [FA2]:** Relate to some literature
- Comment [FA3]:** Relate to some literature: Under conditions of abiotic stresses such as high temperatures, the production of species reactive oxygen species (ROS). EROs are reduced forms molecular oxygen, extremely reactive and may cause oxidative damage to various components cells, including chloroplasts, mitochondria, membrane plasma, peroxisomes, cell wall and apoplast. explain and discuss
- Comment [FA4]:** explain and discuss why
- Comment [FA5]:** you reference. However, you again do not support your hypothesis with convincing arguments, directed to a plausible explanation. Showing that the results are observed in other works is not the same as explaining the phenomenon.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>something continuous in the text present the results without explaining them only with regard to some works. the work needs a review and further deepen the discussions. the work is superficial, however, with adjustments in the discussion can be published.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments spell-check check the second figure. it is confusing to identify who the control is. Specify in caption</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p><i>Flávio Wirlan Andrade da Silva</i></p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p><i>State University of Northern Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</i></p>