

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122845
Title of the Manuscript:	BER PRODUCTION IN ARID ZONES: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE FUTURE
Type of the Article	Review

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive view of the problems, opportunities and difficulties of ber, and will be useful for audiences without a scientific background looking for surface information at one place. This manuscript does not provide new information, nor does it present empirical data of experiments or studies done previously. It explains general but comprehensive aspects of ber.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	BER PRODUCTION IN ARID ZONES: CHALLENGES, MANAGEMENT AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE FUTURE	
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.	Rewrite "This abstract explores" as "This review explores"	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Include data of {climate change, agricultural production, impact of climate change on agriculture} in the introduction, and how adopting ber has improved upon the difficulties {in respective sections}.</p> <p>Include information relating to climatic requirements (temp, light, nutrients, water) of ber.</p> <p>Moving the "3. current status" to number 2 and merging sections "2 adaptations" and "4 mechanisms" is advised. If section 4 is to be kept separate, it must discuss the molecular mechanisms and not just the morphological mechanisms. Additionally, refer to studies that show Ber's ability to thrive in arid conditions.</p> <p>Removing the text "A Comparative Analysis" from 4 ": Challenges and Control Measures" from 8 "in Ber Production" from 9 "for Ber Fruits in Arid Regions" from 10 "for Sustainable Agriculture in Arid Zones" from 11 "Soil Stabilization and Desertification Control" from 12</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.	This review is scientifically correct. However, there is a need of mentioning of the results of various experiments conducted on ber.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is a general lack of reference to studies or experiments conducted. The authors should include examples of studies (with empirical data) that have shown or disproven ber's effectiveness in each of the mentioned advantages. There is much content in the manuscript that needs to be cited specially in introduction and discussion sections other than 5, 6, and 7.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is suitable.	
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:	Prashant Gyanwali
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal