



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43853
Title of the Manuscript:	Physiological potential of seeds of Dovyalis abyssinica under different light quality
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>)

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	The paper need to improve. The English language of the paper has to be revised by a native spoken English person. There are many sentences that I could not understand.	We appreciate the comments and corrections, and have tried to correct the best possible Sorry for english, it has been revised now
Minor REVISION comments	In authors' instructions is said "It should not exceed 300 words in length". This Abstract has 351 words, please, reduce it at least to 300 words. What do force mean?? Force does mean Vigor???. In Abstract, authors have to give the results according to statistical analysis (ANOVA and Tukey test, then Why did authors apply them??? Authors have to delete the results for germination and writhe the following: The germination percentage were similar ($p > 0.05$) among absence of light, and yellow, red and white lights and Why the results are about germination percentage and in Conclusion authors highlight the traits index of germination speed, mean germination time and performance of seedlings???! In Material and Methods: Authors have to indicate the mean and standard deviation of the room temperature In Results and Discussion: Some results are mentioned without taking account the statistical analysis and some of them are very confusing. Discussion is scarce- Authors should explain better their results, esepcialy, those of seedling traits CONCLUSÃO or CONCLUSION??. In conclusion the sentence "...with direct effects on its physiological potential" was not demonstrated in this paper.	Thanks for the improvements.
Optional/General comments	The comments and suggestions are in the document using Microsoft Word features: comment insert and track change This paper could be accepted with very major revisions. After all corrections and suggestions are made, especially that referred to English language revision, , the paper should be published as TECHNICAL NOTE OR SHORT COMMUNICATION	