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	This works seeks to investigate the performance of three Valencia cultivars after budding on Volkamer lemon, however, the title 'Evaluation of some Valencia cvs. performance under new reclaimed soil conditions' is misleading since no data is presented on the reclaimed soil conditions. Also comparisons between different soil conditions were no carried out. The paper will become suitable for publication after the comments have been addressed	Thank you for your comment, actually, the comparison between different soil conditions is a very good idea, but the idea of this research point based on the evaluation of three Valencia cvs. trees at eleven years old, grown in new reclaimed soil conditions.
Minor REVISION comments	Although the auhors presented differences in the performance of the 3 species after budding, no explanation is offered as o why these differences were observed. The English grammar, punctuations and general quality of writing needs improvement as some sentences are very difficult to undersand. According to the authors- The total number of trees in this experiment was forty five trees (3 cultivars x 5 replicate x 3 trees in each replicate)-, however, only single point measurements are presented without errors. How were significant differences beween the different groups estimated?	The differences between the three species are attributed to the anatomical differences in the leaf and the structures of fruitlets which reflected on the trees canopy, yield and fruit quality of them. The English language has been checked All data of forty-five trees were statistically analyzed by using COSTAT program and the mean values of the three replicates were presented in tables. The Duncans test was used to compare the mean values.
Optional/General comments		

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)*	