SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAERI_50717**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effects of Seed Weights and Sowing Media on Germination and Early Growth of Afzelia africana. Smith ex pers**
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	1. Once you introduce *Afzelia Africana*, no need of writing its full name. Write *A. Africana* 2. The abstract is paragraphed. This should be the case and should be summarized. No need of writing eg. '*measured with sensitive weighing balance'*. We expect all balance to be calibrated. Change to weighed and summarize where applicable 3. Too many abbreviations in the abstract which tire the reader. Have a section of acronyms and abbreviations and try to minimize them in the abstract 4. The introduction is well written but lengthy. Try to summarize it too. No need of 53-58 5. Materials and methods: well written. 6. Data analysis: Poorly written. Remove all formulas. Just summaries how the data was analysed. The formulas quotes in this section should all appear under their corresponding Materials and methods 7. Results and discussion: Poor written. Tate the results in a narrative and cite the tables and figs. This is a presentation of results in tables and figs. No discussion. However, delete Tables 3 and 4. The separation of the means should be done using letters in their respective Tables. No legend of the tables. This should also be extended to all other tables and figs which have similar mistakes such as *Table on 'Effects of different seed weights on the mean height growth'.* Only state the results and do not discuss them here. 8. Fig. 1. No error bars and the plot does not appear good. Do not extend the bars too much. If possible, use another software to draw the graph. Excel does not produce good graphs. Avoid coloured bars. 9. All figures and tables should be put after references in the manuscript for ease of review. This is too confusing to review. 10. Discussion: Too lengthy for the results obtained. Avoid discussing things outside the results. Can be improved. 11. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION: Should be only conclusion. A two-sentence conclusion will be good. **It is CRITICAL that the author(s) presents photos/pictures of the work. It is very hard to approve this research without such. Anyone can get these numbers presented but not pictures.**	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Wilton Mbinda***
Department, University & Country	***Pwani University, Kenya***