

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_119135
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovative seed treatment for <i>Cassia siamea</i> Lam. germination and carbon stock analysis in varied stem sizes for sustainable land management and climate change mitigation
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes. The Manuscript provides a content with scientific merit. Carbon stock has long been a global concern and researching aspects as this is of paramount towards better scientific understanding.</li> <li>2. Yes. The title suits and appropriate enough in relation to the manuscript's content.</li> <li>3. Yes. The abstract is concise and is comprehensive enough.</li> <li>4. Introductions were outstanding. Though under materials and methods, I think it should specify the ratio used on the soil mixture for replicability also it is important to specify amount (in weight) of soil mixture used in pots.</li> <li>5. Yes. Statistically and scientifically sound results were observed in the manuscript. The discussion was robust and appropriate enough given the study results</li> <li>6. References are recent and sufficient enough.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The article provides an excellent command of English with quality suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bryan Glomel S. Silverio</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of the Philippines, Philippines</b>