

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126787
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of Germination capacity, Germination value, T-50, Peak Value, Mean Germination Time, and Germination Rate for Melia volknesii seed collected from Kibwezi seed orchard
Type of the Article	

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)
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.	Given the growing challenges of climate change, research on drought-tolerant species like <i>M. volkensii</i> is highly relevant. The article could provide insights into selecting species for reforestation, land restoration, and sustainable agriculture in water-scarce regions. The text could benefit from improvements in readability and grammar, starting with the correct spelling of the plant name, <i>Melia volkensii</i> .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is quite long and could be made more concise while still conveying the main points.	
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.	Please add or modify these essential points: <input type="checkbox"/> Background: Briefly state the importance of <i>Melia volkensii</i> in dryland ecosystems and why its germination study is relevant. <input type="checkbox"/> Methods: Summarize without excessive procedural detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Results: Highlight key findings, such as onset, peak germination, and the significance of indices like T50 and Mean Daily Germination. <input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion/Implications: Emphasize the practical significance of the findings, e.g., how they contribute to conservation or forestry practices.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There are areas for improvement. While the abstract contains substantial detail about the methods, the methods section itself lacks sufficient detail for reproducibility. It would be beneficial to incorporate more information in the methods section, as this will allow readers to fully understand and potentially replicate the study. Additionally, the objectives could be integrated into the introduction for a more cohesive flow. The introduction would also benefit from a statement highlighting the significance of the study, such as identifying germination patterns that inform seed management practices for conservation and reforestation efforts. This would help readers appreciate the broader impact and practical applications of the research.	
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.	The methods section lacks sufficient detail for full reproducibility. I recommend specifying in this section (not in the abstract) whether the seeds were sterilized or treated before planting. Additionally, terms like "shallow drills and light covering" are somewhat vague. Providing specific details on the drill depth, type of soil or growth medium, light levels, and watering conditions would greatly enhance reproducibility. Please also mention which germination indices were calculated and include the exact formulas, especially if they are not readily accessible in the cited sources. If the study involves environmental factors (e.g., temperature, humidity), these should be stated clearly, particularly if they might affect germination. Figure 1 lacks a footnote that defines abbreviations like G%, T50, and MGT, which would be helpful for	

Review Form 3

	<p>readers who may not be familiar with these terms.</p> <p>The introduction and discussion sections would benefit from additional context on the study's significance. Clearly highlighting the practical applications and broader impact, such as contributions to seed management, conservation, and reforestation, would enhance the article's relevance.</p> <p>I recommend simplifying complex sentences and correcting grammatical issues throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Additional recent references could enhance the manuscript's depth and provide a broader context for the findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some sections would benefit from further refinement to meet scholarly communication standards</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Soledad Mora Vásquez</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>School of Engineering and Sciences, Tecnologico de Monterrey, Mexico</p>