

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_126655
Title of the Manuscript:	First report of <i>Dendrophthoe falcata</i> (I. F.) Ettingsh on important Agroforestry species: <i>Populus deltoides</i> and <i>Melia dubia</i>
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I loved seeing the figure 1, but would have liked to see some close ups on the sight of parasitisation. For I found the galling effects the most interesting thing of the paper. Most of the other concepts were captured in the one reference # 20. Generally, this topic is rather important but as is currently written it seems to miss the desired goal to focus upon the two forest and timber species Poplar and Melia.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As is the title is poorly in focus. Specifically on the Agroforestry is used throughout but is wrongly used, since no co-cropping system is used. Rather the focus should be on the forestry management and timber quality. First report should not be used as there is a substantial lack of incidence data on the occurrence of the parasitic plant. <i>Dendrophthoe falcata</i> (I. F.) Ettingsh effects on timber quality and trees health of: <i>Populus deltoides</i> and <i>Melia dubia</i> within India.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract contains misleading information “crown gall” is another separate disease, galling is the more apt word. The abstract is rather weak setting up information that is not really followed up on, specifically the effects on timber quality, incidence data, management practices, and host-specificity (this was particularly confused). Refocus on the specific interactions between the tree-parasite-farmer.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Materials and methods is particularly lacking at one paragraph. There does not seem to really be any “results” and so only discussion seem descriptive, here also figure one is out of place and should be moved to the intro.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Generally, no this manuscript seems to lack critical scientifically important details, specifically on incidence reporting data for occurrence. Following that life cycle, infection process, induced effects on the host, qualifying metrics on how the timber quality is affected are all missing. There are also distracting focal points such as the botanical descriptions of the plant, the medical aspects, the distribution by birds is rather interesting but short. Overall all there are multiple problems in the terminology used: agroforestry should be forestry, what kind of parasitic plant, and the host specificity is more confusing than informative.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	With the focus on the medical aspects of the plant, there is a paper that comes in the first results from google that is missing. (DOI: 10.3389/fphar.2023.1096379) All references are missing their DOIs, and missing intext citations in species lists. #20 at 2020 is the most recent publication and is so missing rather recent articles.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. At the current level it reads as a disorder non-scientific text. The misuse of terminologies and missing data and concepts leave the article to miss its desired goal to highlight the need for more research on the effects of infection by the parasite on the timber quality of species X and X. The English is fine, and overall is readable, while the order could be better and off topic focal points reduced. The article is readable but does not quite reach the technical and scientific language specific to forestry or plant pathology.	
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:	Andrew Gennett
Department, University & Country	Technical University of Berlin, Germany