



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_62839</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effects of pre-sowing treatments and abiotic stress on the germination of Ceratonia siliqua seeds of four biomes Moroccan</b>
Type of the 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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In introduction</b>, please add some citation relate to requirement of the seed in terms of viability and vigor (germination stage), because the treatment given to the seed not to the plant.</li> <li>• <b>In Materials and Methods</b> It should be well-arranged and detailed in materials &amp; methods and design of experiment related to ANOVA analyses. Because there were three pre sowing treatments and three abiotic stress (osmotic, saline and thermal - with different level of it) from seven population of carob in four regions in this experiment.  Actually this work consisted of two stages of experiment. First is experiment of pre sowing treatment. The optimum result from the first experiment will be used on further (second) experiment with different treatment (salt, water and heat stress). Then, for salt and water stress treatments, the germination test used the optimum temperature from heat stress treatment. It did not well informed in this section.</li> <li>• <b>In Conclusion</b> As the treatment and written in the title, the pre sowing treatment did not mention in this section</li> <li>• The references and citation written was not formatted according to the Author Guideline</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Some minor revision done in the article directly	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Actually, this article might be divided in to several articles. Too much information in one article, so it made the effect of one treatment to others did not explain well. For example, the effect of pre sowing treatment combine with other treatment on seed, as well as the design of the experiment.</p> <p>Many things done in this experiment would be a good article if it well-managed. I appreciate all work done in this experiment.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<i>Rahmi Dianita</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Jambi, Indonesia</i>