SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIB_53674**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of some Valencia cvs. performance under new reclaimed soil conditions**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		Thank you very much for your guidance.
Minor REVISION comments	Cultivars names should be enclosed in quotation marks 'Campbell', 'Olinda' and 'Delta' not Campbell, Olinda and Delta. Please change it in whole manuscript text. In every tables standard deviation (SD) or standard error (SE) is missing. Please add it to average value. Table 2 If authors decided give full values, please do it in each tables, so values should be: 262 not 262.5 or 477 not 477.5. Please change it. Similar remark about SD or SE in present figures. Please add missing thing. References does not meet the requirements of the journal. Positions are given in various format standards. Please, unify all items. In my opinion, using the reference items from 1988–1999 is inappropriate (Not including methodological protocols). There is a lot of literature from 2015-2018 describing the experimental problem.	The requested correction has been made. This correction may lead to a change in the number of column per Table consequently the number of tables The requested correction has been made. The references style has been checked Actually there are many recent papers in this respect but the present citations in the text are more close agreement with the obtained data
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	