Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_56252**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Priming with Methylene Blue Enhances the Antioxidant Properties and Germination Power of Cowpea, Millet and Sorghum Seeds**
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	**In the ABSTRACT, the authors are asked to make an introduction, and to put two sentences describing the importance of the study and what is the need to do this research.** **It is necessary to insert the objective of the study, in a clear and direct way, as the last sentence of the introduction** **I think that the results obtained in the present work are not well discussed. I think it is necessary to make a stronger connection between your results and the references cited in the text.** **In some phrases, I also think it is necessary to make a relationship between the results and the references cited. Apparently, results of other research are inserted, but there should be a relationship with the work, and there is not!**	The suggestions of the reviewer have been implemented The objective of the study has been clearly stated The discussion has been revised taking into consideration the suggestions of the reviewer The discussion has been revised taking into consideration the suggestions of the reviewer
Minor REVISION comments	**In the ABSTRACT, I suggest that the authors put a concluding sentence.** **In the keywords, it is important to put the scientific names of the species tested.** **In conclusion, the authors must correct. In general, it is reported in short sentences, if the objective has been achieved.** **In the references, the authors must follow the rules of this journal, making the necessary corrections.**	The suggestions of the reviewer have been implemented The suggestions of the reviewer have been implemented The suggestions of the reviewer have been implemented
Optional/General comments	**Authors should check the rules of this journal and adapt to the rules.** **Insert the averages in the graphs.** **The work is interesting and deserves publication. However, it is important to make the suggested corrections. The main correction is to adjust the text in the Results and Discussion, aiming to relate the results obtained with the cited references. As it stands, there is only a description of other results obtained by other researchers. Other minor fixes are also needed.**	The suggestions of the reviewer have been implemented The suggestion by the reviewer that the average results should be inserted in the graphs was not implemented. This will lead to presenting the same data three time as some average results were mentioned in the Results and Discussion section.

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	