

Manuscript: “**Effects of Different Seeds Pretreatments on the Germination of Five Local Trees: Four From The Fabaceae Family and One From the Bombacacea**”

Submitted: 29 September 2021

Accepted: 12 November 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Tyano Abdoulaye

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p89

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: L.J.G. van der Maesen, Wageningen/the Netherlands

Reviewer 2: Abdelfettah MAOUNI, Abdelmalek Essaadi University - Morocco

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: L.J.G. van der Maesen	
University/Country: Wageningen/the Netherlands	
Date Manuscript Received: 20-10-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 25-20-2021
Manuscript Title: Effects of different seeds pretreatments on the germination of local trees: <i>Acacia nilotica</i> (Mimosoideae), <i>Adansonia digitata</i> (Bombacaceae), <i>Parkia biglobosa</i> (Mimosoideae), <i>Piliostigma reticulatum</i> (Caesalpinioideae), and <i>Tamarindus indica</i> (Caesalpinioideae)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ?	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/--	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>The title describes clearly what is investigated</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>A bit lengthy, I edited the same.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The authors being francophone wrote English in a verbose way with several errors and spelling mistakes, also punctuation leaves to be desired. Some French headings were not translated into English.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>Some details need to be added, see edited version of the MS.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>The results are explained well but in a verbose way.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Conclusions and summary are OK.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Indeed.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See edited version of the MS.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Lengthy paper with nice photographs and tables, could have been presented more concisely.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Abdelfettah MAOUNI	
University/Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi University - Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/10/2021	Date Review Report 2 Submitted: 06/10/2021
Manuscript Title: Effects of different seeds pretreatments on the germination of local species: the case of <i>Acacia nilotica</i>, <i>Adansonia digitata</i>, <i>Parkia biglobosa</i>, <i>Piliostigma reticulatum</i>, and <i>Tamarindus indica</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1039/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<p>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</p> <p>You did not understand me. This title is too long now Effects of different seeds pretreatments on the germination of local trees: the case of <i>Acacia nilotica</i> (Mimosaceae), <i>Adansonia digitata</i> (Bombacaceae), <i>Parkia biglobosa</i> (Mimosaceae), <i>Piliostigma reticulatum</i> (Caesalpinioideae), and <i>Tamarindus indica</i> (Caesalpinioideae) I suggest this title :Effects of different seeds pretreatments on the germination of five local trees: four from the Fabaceae family and one from the Bombacaceae</p>	4
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p> <p>Key words: Germination, seeds, dormancy, pretreatment, Mimosaceae trees, Bombacaceae trees</p>	4

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
–	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>Study Species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was appropriate to give images of the seeds and to discuss their particularities especially tegumentary instead of giving images of the trees <p>Seedlings: To specify</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support in petri dishes: The support in the petri dishes were table lotus. blotting paper Temperature and humidity conditions ??? 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p>Please answer these questions to improve your work</p> <p>To specify signification under all graphs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Values are expressed as means (\pm SD) – Standard variation (\pm SD) in each histogram of graph – Means within a graphic column followed by the same lowercase letter are not significantly different at $p < 0.05$ – Range test in analysis of variance (ANOVA) <p>It was appropriate to compare the germination rate after 30 days of all species (given table)</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
–	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

*~~1.3.~~ Effets des différents prétraitements sur la germination de *Parkia biglobosa* (Jacq.) R. Br. ex G. Don*