



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



**Paper: “Effects of Pre-Germination Treatments on Seed Germination of Pachypodium
mikea Lüthy, an Endemic Xerophytic Species from Southwestern Madagascar”**

Submitted: 28 August 2026

Accepted: 05 October 2026

Published: 31 October 2026

Corresponding Author: Moratahina Armand Ravaoarisoa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valeria Alejandra Santa
Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Njike Merlin
Université de Yaoundé I, Cameroun

Reviewer 3: Harouna Issa Amadou
University Abdou Moumouni, Niger

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Valeria Santa	
University, Country: Universidad Nacional Rio Cuarto- Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/09/2026	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Effects of Pre-Germination Treatments on Seed Germination of <i>Pachypodium mikea</i> Lüthy, an Endemic Xerophytic Species from Southwestern Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that 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.

Questions	Rating Result
-----------	---------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The figures shown in the work are not mentioned in the text Scientific names should be written in italics	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The graphics don't have titles and the legends should be in English, like the paper	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
There are citations in the text that are not found in the bibliography Moratahina R.,2025 is not cited in bibliography There are references in the bibliography that aren't in the text	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Pr HAROUNA ISSA Amadou	
University, Country: University Abdou Moumouni, Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/09/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/09/2028
Manuscript Title: Effects of Pre-Germination Treatments on Seed Germination of <i>Pachypodium mikea</i> Lüthy, an Endemic Xerophytic Species from Southwestern Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16...22-09-2026	
You agree that 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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>Some results are missind in the abstract (germination dynamics)??</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Non-essential parts are included in the text)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results were not sufficiently developed</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion is lengthy and includes several recommendations; the conclusion itself needs to be revised.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references would be completed</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title corresponds to the content of the research work developed in the body of the manuscript.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

ABSTRACT

The abstract clearly presents objectives, method, results and conclusion. But The author somewhere presented the material before the method: The sentence " The seeds were elongated and fusiform, measuring on average 8.04 ± 0.71 mm in length, 2.83 ± 0.35 mm in width and 1.29 ± 0.19 mm in thickness " which appears to describe the biological material of the study is placed before the description of the method of the study.

You only presented the results of the comparison between the boiling water treatment and the control, but nowhere did you compare the other treatments, first among themselves and then with the control. You have three heat treatments. It would also be interesting to know the levels of effectiveness of these treatments. Therefore, a stratification of increasing effectiveness of the heat treatments should be considered.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The content of the work does not contain enough grammatical errors. But the introduction is not concise. Many unnecessary sections, more akin to a dissertation than a scientific article, should be removed. The author has focused more on the botanical description of the species than on the seeds, which actually constitute the biological material of the study. In scientific article terms, it is a poorly structured introduction. The research problem, which also needs to be synthesized, should be followed by the research questions, then the objectives, and in a synchronized manner.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The two sections are not clearly distinct. The description of the study site is lengthy. The map provided is very general and does not precisely show the nursery site where the study was conducted. The biological material (the seeds) has not been described. No photos of these seeds are shown. The non-biological equipment used to measure water temperature is not specified, nor is the equipment used to take morphometric measurements . The experimental setup is not presented. The treatments were not randomized, which significantly increases bias in the data and the resulting findings.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are relevant, but the fact that the experimental design lacks independent replicates and is not randomized prevents the results from being validated. Photograph (Figure 6) of Pachypodium seeds Mikea, positioned at the results level, provides no information. The figures have two titles; one above and the other below.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Very verbose, needs to be reformulated in a more concise way. The conclusion does not clearly indicate whether the research hypotheses stated at the outset of the study were validated or invalidated.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references are appropriate. Overall, poorly presented. Page numbers for the books and articles consulted are missing.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Authors should not confuse a thesis with a scientific article, which is essentially a presentation of the innovative substance of the research conducted. Furthermore, they must carefully read the author guidelines for each journal and prepare their manuscript in accordance with those guidelines before submitting it.
