



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_27203
Title of the Manuscript:	Changes in levels of soluble sugar, reducing sugar and lipid during germination of seeds of Albizia procera
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>Lines 189-225: All this part is part of materials and methods and some of these details have already been given. Therefore, bring in materials and methods, and remove duplications.</p> <p>Lines 262-269: This part must be in materials and methods.</p> <p>Lines 336-361: This part provides no new information. It is only a repetition of results, just to fill pages. But if you consider that it better summarizes the results, you can let it by removing the figures 14, 15, 16 and the entire portion from line 226 to line 335.</p>	Agreed in full and all necessary corrections done as advised.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Lines 32, 33, 41: (Troup, 1921) instead of (Troup 1921)</p> <p>Line 38: 10 mm instead of 10mm</p> <p>Line 55, 59: (Parrotta, 1987) instead of (Parrotta 1987)</p> <p>Line 62: 20,000-24,000 instead of 20,000-24000</p> <p>Line 73 : These data are not only geological ; there are also climatic data</p> <p>Line 122: were added instead of was added</p> <p>Lines 141-143: Rather: To this solution, 1.0 ml 5% aqueous phenol and 5 ml concentrated chilled 96%</p>	All points were revised and complied except for lines 363 – 378 which are integral part of the text, so brought forward after the subtitle “Results”. All the points mentioned have been taken care in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>sulfuric acid were added and shaken well for 10 minutes, then placed in boiling water bath at 25-30° C for 20 minutes.</p> <p>Lines 161-162: The sentence “To this 15 g of copper sulphate as a 10% (w /v) solution was added...” must be revised.</p> <p>Line 164: “(4ml of solution and 96ml of solution b)”. Do you mean (4 ml of solution a and 96 ml of solution b)?</p> <p>Line 174: Rather “To this, 1.0 ml of Somogyi’s copper reagent was added.”</p> <p>Line 192: “...in dry humid condition”. Dry and humid in the same time? Check!</p> <p>Lines 363-378: It is a duplication of results and methods, not necessary here.</p> <p>Line 368: Nelson-Somogyi (1952) is not in the references.</p> <p>Line 391: Anthony and Robert, 1978 is not in the references.</p> <p>Line 432: Tonguc <i>et al.</i> (2010) is not in the references.</p> <p>Line 437: Koster <i>et al.</i> (1988) or Koster and Leopold (1988) ?</p> <p>Line 486: Huang, A.H. and Moreau, R.A. (1978) is not cited</p> <p>Line 492: Little, E.L., Jr., Wadsworth, F.H. (1964) or Little, E.L., Wadsworth, F.H. (1964)</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 520: Tonguc <i>et al.</i> (2012) is not cited	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The three provenances of the trees were not compared with each other in the discussion. So why treat these three trees separately in the results, insofar as they belong to the same species? You could give in each case the average of these three trees if the goal was not to compare them.	The format followed to write the paper is a generally acceptable approach. Therefore, this point couldn't be accommodated by the author. However, if the editors think, they are free to revise the matter as per their discretion.