

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_109305
Title of the Manuscript:	Regenerative potential of white gum (<i>Senegalia senegal</i> L. Willd.) by rejection in the Chari Baguirmi region of Chad
Type of the Article	Review Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript explores the regenerative potential of <i>Senegalia senegal</i> (white gum) through natural vegetative propagation. The study is significant for the scientific community, especially those involved in agroforestry, as it addresses the challenges and potential solutions for sustainable management of <i>S. senegal</i>. The findings contribute valuable insights into the species' regeneration, shedding light on the need for a management plan and domestication strategies.</p> <p>2. The title is somewhat suitable but could be improved for clarity and specificity. Consider revising it to something like, "Assessing the Natural Regeneration Potential of <i>Senegalia senegal</i> in Chad: Implications for Sustainable Management."</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a concise overview of the study, including the methodology and key results. However, it could benefit from some minor improvements for clarity. Specify the research's significance and implications more explicitly. For instance, highlight the urgency of sustainable management and the role of assisted natural regeneration.</p> <p>4. The subsections and overall structure are appropriate, providing a clear flow from the introduction to methods, results, and conclusion. However, consider breaking down the methodology section into more specific subheadings for better organization and readability.</p> <p>5. The findings align with the objectives of the study. However, clarifications on certain points, such as the survival rate's dependence on shoot size, would enhance the manuscript's robustness.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and cover a range of relevant sources. However, to strengthen the literature review, consider incorporating more recent references, especially those from the last five years, to demonstrate the current state of research in this field. Additionally, check for consistency in citation styles throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally acceptable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written, and the technical terminology is appropriate for the scientific context. However, there are some instances where sentence structure and word choices could be refined for better clarity and precision. Additionally, attention to minor grammatical errors and formatting consistency would further improve the overall readability of the manuscript. Consider a final proofreading to ensure linguistic accuracy and coherence.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a significant topic but requires revisions for clarity, organization, and some scientific precision. Improvements in language, structure, and additional clarification in certain sections would enhance the manuscript's overall quality and impact.</p>	

PART 2:

Review Form 1.7

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ponugoti Mounica
Department, University & Country	Hindu College of Pharmacy, India