



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_50655
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of seed source, moisture content and duration of storage on the viability of Vitellaria paradoxa C.F. Gaertn
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>1) Title: Effects of seed source, moisture content and duration of storage on the viability of <i>Vitellaria paradoxa</i> C.F. Gaertn. The title is not consistent with the collected data, because their results did not show any the seed viability.</p> <p>2) The objective of this manuscript in Line 35-36,..... with a view to recommending best storage option(s) for the species. But their results are not consistent with their objectives.</p> <p>3) Materials and Methods: What program they used for data analysis?.</p> <p>4) Discussion: Authors should add their discussion as follows:</p> <p>4.1 Why three seed sources showed no significant effect on the seed germination?</p> <p>4.2 Why two moisture contents showed no significant effect on the seed germination?</p> <p>4.3 Why seed storage at -20° and 5°C showed the zero germination?</p> <p>4.4 Why the longer storage duration affected to the lower seed germination?</p> <p>5) From Table 2, SD, ST and SD X ST revealed the significant results, thus authors should showed the differences between treatments.</p> <p>6) Reference of Yameogo <i>et al.</i>, (2000) not found in the reference list.</p> <p>7) Reference list of Beyranvand H,..... Response of yield and yield components of maize (<i>Zea mayz</i> L.) change to Beyranvand H,..... Response of yield and yield components of maize (<i>Zea mayz</i> L.)</p> <p>8) Reference list of Bonkougou EG. The Shea Tree (<i>Vitellaria paradoxa</i>) change to Bonkougou EG. The Shea Tree (<i>Vitellaria paradoxa</i>)</p> <p>9) Reference list of Lady B, lack of published year.</p> <p>10) From their results, how authors recommend the method for storage this seed in order to still have high seed germination?.</p>	<p>1. Seed viability is dependent on the germination potentials of the seed which could be influenced by several factors. The viability/germination of the seed is presented in line 66- 87 of the Ms.</p> <p>2. Data collected were subjected to Analysis of Variance with the SPSS.16. 0 statistical package</p> <p>3. Discussion Why three seed sources showed no significant effect on the seed germination is in lines 139 and 40 : This implies that its recalcitrant nature of the seeds prevail the effects of the sources.</p> <p>Why two moisture contents showed no significant effect on the seed germination is in line 149 that the range of moisture contents was 32- 43% as against 20 – 26%. Where mortality could be higher.</p> <p>Why seed storage at -20° and 5°C showed the zero germination is in line 141</p> <p>Why the longer storage duration affected to the lower seed germination is in line 145 that <i>V. paradoxa</i> is recalcitrant in nature and thus has short physiological storability and viability status The corrections on referencing have been attended to in the Ms. The recommendation is for short period based on the findings.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	

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>	