

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_129426
Title of the Manuscript:	REGENERATION STATUS OF DIFFERENT CONIFERS IN GULMARG FOREST RANGE OF KASHMIR HIMALAYAS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	There should be no period (full stop) at the end of the manuscript title to maintain proper formatting conventions.	
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 formatting errors in the coordinates should be corrected to ensure consistency and accuracy. Additionally, the abstract should conclude with 2-3 lines of clear and actionable recommendations to enhance the study's practical significance and relevance.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is not fully aligned with scientific standards, as it contains many mistakes and errors. However, it is a commendable attempt with a well-defined and meaningful objective.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The citations in the discussion section rely on older references, which do not adequately reflect the current research trends. Suggested references: Tiwari, O. P., Sharma, C. M., Rana, Y. S., & Krishan, R. (2019). Disturbance, diversity, regeneration and composition in temperate forests of Western Himalaya, India. <i>Journal of forest and environmental science</i> , 35(1), 6-24. Tiwari, O. P., Rana, Y. S., Krishan, R., Sharma, C. M., & Bhandari, B. S. (2018). Regeneration dynamics, population structure, and forest composition in some ridge forests of the Western Himalaya, India. <i>Forest science and technology</i> , 14(2), 66-75.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used in the manuscript is poor, and the formatting of the text is inconsistent throughout the paper. This needs to be improved for clarity, readability, and professional presentation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several statements in the introduction lack references to support the claims, making the arguments appear unsubstantiated, and there is also a lack of a clear rationale behind the research, which weakens the connection between the study's objectives and its significance in addressing existing knowledge gaps. • The methodology section of the paper need better clarity and detail. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The quadrant size used for sampling is not clearly mentioned, leaving uncertainty about the area surveyed (Why 50x20 and 2x2; number of plots). 2. The methods employed to analyze edaphic factors are not cited, making it unclear what procedures or instruments were used. 3. The calculation process for the values presented in Table 4, such as light influx and electrical conductivity, is not explained in the methods section, which affects the transparency of the study. 4. The correlation mentioned in the discussion and conclusion is neither provided in the table nor detailed in the methodology regarding the methods used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 1 contains errors in the formatting of elevation and coordinates. • The citations in the discussion section rely on older references, which do not adequately reflect the current research trends. • The results of the regeneration percentage (whether similar or dissimilar) are not sufficiently correlated with findings from other research. • The result section lacks a clear discussion of the main findings of your study in the text, relying solely on citations of tables. It is essential to summarize and interpret the key results within the text to provide context and highlight their significance, rather than leaving the interpretation entirely to the reader. • Units are missing in the text. Appropriate units should be included wherever necessary to ensure clarity and accuracy. • Some species names in the table are not italicized, which deviates from standard scientific formatting conventions. • The conclusion should emphasize the major findings of the study, focusing specifically on the results obtained. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Hind Bhushan Kuniyal</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>H.N.B. Garhwal University, India</p>