

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_97660
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of 2,4-dichloro Phenoxy Acetic Acid on Seeds Productivity of Mesquite (<i>Prosopis juliflora</i> Swarz) DC
Type of the 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)	Yes, this manuscript is of great value as it presents an option to solve the problem of desertification in semi arid regions of Sudan as the method used permit decrease the productivity of pods per inflorescence and seeds per pod of <i>Prosopis juliflora</i> Swarz. The title is suitable Yes the abstract is comprehensive Generally the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate meanwhile some comments are attributed to the manuscript to be taken in account (introduction Material and methods and conclusion). Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct unless it could be reinforced if the comments are taken in account. References could be toughened by adding especially current ones from the last five years(2018-2023)- The author is highly encouraged to continue researches in domain of solving the problem of desertification.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
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:	Bengouga Khalila
Department, University & Country	CRSTRA, Algeria