



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_26810
Title of the Manuscript:	Pre-treatment Germination Percentages Affected the Advantage of Priming Treatment in Pepper Seeds
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction The introduction is too simply. Should add the more recent related-research and references into this section. Material and methods -How many seeds is there every lot of pepper seeds? -Why not using 1/2 MS medium for the priming Treatment of seeds? -How statistical analysis should be shown in detail. Results -In table 1, it's better that add a line at the end to show the mean value $\pm$SD of 12 seed lots.	We improved the introduction section and put a few new articles. However, on the other hand simple and plain hypothesis of a paper is good to me. We add some new references. Priming is the topic that large number of papers are published every year. But not many use more than a few seed lots. In our work we used 12 lots. The basic aspect should be the originality which exists in our text. Each lot has 10 grams of seed. That amount is enough. 1/2 MS medium is interesting suggestion. Thank you for that. We have never thought about that. However, most of the plant growth components in the MS medium. So can be a very good alternative. We will think of that. Statistical analyses were added at the end of the Material and Methods section. We did Anova test and put the letter along with the numbers. That will show what extent the differences are



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Discussion It is lack for the comparison and analysis of the data with other related-researches.	seen among the values.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It is needed that supplementing some new references into both introduction and discussion.	Yes we added some new references in both sections.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		