

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_122327
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity of seedlings in the Kerangas Forest Kersik Luway Nature Reserve
Type of the Article	

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>It is important to understand for comprehending forest dynamics, promoting conservation and management, mitigating climate change, and preserving ecosystem services. It provides a clue for the future health and resilience of the reserved forest.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>It needs amendment. The title have to be changed to (Diversity of saplings in the Kerangas Forest Kersik Luway Nature Reserve)</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>Not comprehensive. It lacks many things: Importance of the study, conclusion and/or recommendation, usage of un necessary words (like tribe and sensus), and also identifying the analysis part IVI and H' in the abstract, but, there was no data analysed were observed in the result part.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It also lacks. The site description is not structured well. For example, It occurs in the result and discussion part. There is no map of the study area? The sampled plot design also not configured under the methodology part.</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>"Scientific correctness" of a manuscript refers to how accurately and rigorously the research is conducted, presented, and interpreted. In this manuscript the experimental design, analysis and the language and style used have to be corrected as the comment given in the manuscript. For information, the manuscript methodology part has to be(Sound experimental design, Appropriate data collection and analysis, and Transparency and reproducibility). The Results and Interpretation part has to be (Accurate data presentation, Appropriate statistical analysis, and Sound interpretation) . In general, the Language and Style has to be (Clear and concise writing, Scientific terminology and Professional presentation). Please, the author has to correct the manuscript. As the comment given in the article. It could be scientifically robust and technically sound if and only the author correct the article as the comment given (i.e., looking in depth each comment and worked again) otherwise not robust and technically sound.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>It is good in general, but lacks using the same format. The author writes the literature in different formats (particularly when using the year). Look the reference part in the document.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes in general. However, some unnecessary words has to be omitted as the comment given in the document.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Taye Lemma Geleta
Department, University & Country	Ethiopia