

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOB_95785</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of seasonal changes on photosynthetic pigments and proline contents of some plants growing naturally in Tayma region, Saudi Arabia</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes</b> 2. <b>Yes</b> 3. <b>Yes</b> 4. <b>It can improve</b> 5. <b>Yes</b> 6. <b>It can improve</b></p> <p>First of all, congratulations to the authors for the work they have done, which is quite current and defends a clearly innovative idea. Likewise, the reading of the same has been easy to follow and as an easily understandable vocabulary which facilitates the understanding of the idea that the authors want to convey.</p> <p>However, I would advise a series of recommendations: I congratulate the authors for the summary because after reading and analysing it the reader gets an idea of the objective pursued by the authors in this study as well as the main conclusions obtained without forgetting the justification and importance of the idea highlighted and the methodology followed to obtain the results they comment on.</p> <p>The introduction clearly justifies the objective of the research as well as the research gas covered. However, it is advisable to include the parts into which the research is divided at the end of the introduction.</p> <p>Every research article should be supported by a literature review, which does not exist in the manuscript. It is only limited to justifying the idea in the introduction section as well as the research carried out on the same topic to date. However, it would be advisable to include a section on the state of the art on the subject to date.</p> <p>With respect to the methodology, I congratulate the authors because it is clearly described as well as the statistical analysis carried out.</p> <p>In the section on results and exclusion, the main results achieved with the research are clearly stated and are supported in a justifying way by the studies carried out so far, which contributes to a complete discussion section.</p> <p>I recommend that the format of the tables be revised because they are so extensive that in some cases they exceed the tabulations of the article format.</p> <p>As for the conclusions, I would advise that they be expanded as they only describe the main conclusions reached in a general way. It would be useful to describe the research gas covered by the research carried out. The objective pursued with the same as well as the main limitations and future lines of research of the work.</p> <p><b>Once all these proposals have been covered, I would advise revisiting it before making a decision on its publication.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Madel Consuelo Ruiz Rodríguez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Jaén, Spain</b>