

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_128521
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence Of Cultivation Densities On The Technological Characteristics Of The Fibre And Seed Of Cotton (Gossypium Hirsutum L.) In Côte d'Ivoire
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study evaluates the impact of sowing densities on cotton fibre and seed characteristics in Côte d'Ivoire, showing that higher densities improve yield and germination, with minimal effects on other parameters.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is generally suitable	
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 abstract is generally clear but could be enhanced by briefly highlighting the methodology, key findings, and practical implications of sowing densities on cotton production.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct, with appropriate references and methodologies for cotton production studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, though additional studies on climate impact could further strengthen the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with minor improvements needed for clarity and conciseness.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Muhammad Sajjad
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan