

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_98503
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Light Wavelengths on Photosynthetic Rates in Plants
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:

(<https://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript really has little scientific relevance. This study has been carried out previously with this plant, which as we know is almost another model in plant science. The title is not appropriate as it generalizes to all plants when dealing only with spinach. The abstract is incomplete, lacking an introduction. The structure of the manuscript if it is appropriate. Scientifically the manuscript has many important errors. References are incomplete, results are rarely discussed, and some seem of dubious provenance. The introduction is redundant and too basic information is provided for this magazine. Material and methods should be strongly improved. The results are the most acceptable. The discussion needs to be almost completely rewritten. The authors themselves doubt the veracity of the results and allege the occurrence of various possible errors. I believe that this experiment should be repeated before being published, and if possible,	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English, especially grammar and syntactic expressions, should be reviewed by a native speaker, since many cannot be easily understood.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcos Adrián Ruiz Medina
Department, University & Country	Universidad de La Laguna, Spain