



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 <i>Vitellaria paradoxa</i> 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: 4.1 Why three seed sources showed no significant effect on the seed germination? 4.2 Why two moisture contents showed no significant effect on the seed germination? 4.3 Why seed storage at -20° and 5°C showed the zero germination? 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>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjawan Chutichudet
Department, University & Country	Maharakham University, Thailand