



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_38101
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of pre-germination treatments and storage periods on germination and vigour of seeds of three cassava (manihot esculenta crantz) cultivars
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	Line 60 to 81 Where did-you inspire? From literature? Please indicate an author. Interesting result, but the statistical analysis must be improved. Tukeys Honest Significant Difference (HSD) was used for the separation of treatment means. But in the table or figure you did show this difference why? Please use letter a, b or c for showing difference between the results. The discussion must be documented.	Line 60-81: these were procedures which were described into detail since they are not yet documented in literature. The standardised methods used were duly acknowledged (for example germination and vigour tests as described by ISTA, 2007). In scientific writing, it is accepted for authors to describe protocols or methods used into detail when not cited in literature. In basic biometry when treatments are ≥ 3, the use of HSD is preferred since it employs the use of a bigger value in conducting the comparism, hence any differences are a true reflection of the observed treatment outputs. In a three factor experiment such as this, analysed data comes with multiple alphabets making table construction cumbersome and difficult to read. Tables had HSD values at 0.01 significance level which made the interpretation of results easy. In this research, current findings were explicitly related to existing literature and were well-referenced. Documentation is the evidence provided in the form of references or footnotes. Reference list also followed strictly according to the guidelines of this journal.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	No working in this topic on 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017? The major of references are old//	Cassava as a food crop has seen current major research works on its functional properties and processing potentials, the seeds of cassava however have not seen much research attention in recent years except for a few cassava breeders in major producing countries. Efforts were however made to get the most current literature on the physiological seed quality to no avail. Moreover, the propagation of the crop is mainly by stem cuttings making documented information scanty on seed quality.