



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Botany</a>                                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_AJRIB_53674</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Evaluation of some Valencia cvs. performance under new reclaimed soil conditions</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>  |

**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**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>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.</p> <p>The paper will become suitable for publication after the comments have been addressed</p>   |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>Although the authors presented differences in the performance of the 3 species after budding, no explanation is offered as to why these differences were observed.</p> <p>The English grammar, punctuations and general quality of writing needs improvement as some sentences are very difficult to understand.</p> <p>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 between the different groups estimated?</p> |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |   |  |



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b><i>Jerry Ampofo-Asiama</i></b>             |
| Department, University & Country | <b><i>University of Cape Coast, Ghana</i></b> |