

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_125112
Title of the Manuscript:	Allelopathic Effects of Vachellia nubica, Vachellia tortilis and Hyphaene compressa on Seed germination of Prosopis juliflora
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The article "Allelopathic Effects of <i>Vachellia nubica</i>, <i>Vachellia tortilis</i> and <i>Hyphaene compressa</i> on Seed germination of <i>Prosopis juliflora</i>" provides valuable insight into the potential allelopathic interaction between these plants, several points could be considered as areas for improvement or clarification. The article does not clearly state its objectives or hypothesis at the beginning. The abstract lacks clarity, making it challenging for readers to grasp the main findings and significance of the study. A more concise and focused abstract would enhance the article's accessibility.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>No Allelopathic effects of <i>Vachellia nubica</i>, <i>Vachellia tortilis</i> and <i>Hyphaene compressa</i> on germination and seedlings growth of <i>Prosopis juliflora</i></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract lacks clarity, making it challenging for readers to grasp the main findings and significance of the study. A more concise and focused abstract would enhance the article's accessibility.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The article's organization could be improved for better flow and comprehension. Consider restructuring the content to follow a more logical progression, such as starting with the objectives, followed by methods, results, and conclusions. Subheadings within the materials and methods section could help readers navigate the experimental procedures more efficiently.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The rationale for selecting <i>Prosopis juliflora</i> as the test crop is not adequately explained. Providing more information on why this particular plant was chosen would strengthen the justification for the study. The discussion could benefit from a more comprehensive exploration of the practical implications of the findings. How can this knowledge be applied in agriculture or other fields? What are the potential ecological consequences?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>Ensure that all references cited in the text are included in the reference list, and vice versa. Also, check the formatting of the references for consistency.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The introduction could benefit from a more comprehensive literature review. A clear description of the experimental setup would enhance the study's reproducibility. The conclusion section is somewhat vague. It would be beneficial to restate the main findings and clearly outline the implications of the study. Additionally, suggestions for further research could be included. FIGURES : Tables (i). Please statistically analyses data and show significance on each Bar. (ii). For better visual comparison, please divide each Figure separately in 3-Parts (A) Germination, (B). Height, (C) Yield and make Figure in Landscape side by side with same scale.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	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:	Rakesh Kumar Joshi
Department, University & Country	Pt. Lalit Mohan Sharma Campus, Sri Dev Suman Uttarakhand University, India