

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54904

Title: Evaluation of the resistance to water stress of the two (2) agroforestry species in nurseries *Gmelina arborea* and *Jatropha curcas* in Faranah,

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after **minor revision**

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			Fair	
Techn. Quality			Fair	
Clarity		Good		
Significance		Good		

Dr Thirunahari Ugandhar
Reviewer Name:

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Reviewer Comments

General Evaluation

The manuscript presents an important study on the effects of water stress on *Gmelina arborea* and *Jatropha curcas* in nursery conditions. The topic is relevant, especially for dryland agroforestry, climate-resilient species selection, and nursery management. The experimental design is clearly described, and the results are supported with statistical analysis.

However, the manuscript requires major revision to improve clarity, scientific accuracy, English language quality, formatting, and organization. Several sections need restructuring, and numerous grammatical, typographical, and methodological issues must be corrected before the paper can be considered for publication.

Major Comments

1. English Language and Grammar

- The manuscript contains numerous grammatical errors, inconsistent sentence structures, and unclear phrasing.
- A full professional language editing is highly recommended.

2. Title Formatting

- The title contains errors such as "*curcasin Faranah 2 3*".

Suggested title:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Evaluation of Water Stress Resistance in Two Agroforestry Species (*Gmelina arborea* and *Jatropha curcas*) in Nursery Conditions in Faranah

3. Abstract

- The Abstract is too long and includes repeated sentences.
- Key results need to be summarized more concisely.
- Avoid presenting detailed statistics (e.g., specific F-values) in the abstract.
- Improve clarity regarding which species performed better under which treatment.

4. Introduction

- The Introduction is informative but not well structured.
- Several references are cited incorrectly (e.g., missing year or authors truncated).
- The rationale for comparing *Gmelina* and *Jatropha* should be more clearly explained.
- Some statements need proper citation support.

5. Materials and Methods

- Section title should be Materials and Methods, not *Materiel et method*.
- Provide clearer description of:
seed collection and selection criteria,
number of seeds per treatment,
watering volumes used per irrigation,
pot size (dimensions and capacity).
- Clarify whether the experiment was conducted outdoors or under shade.

6. Statistical Analysis

- Provide the exact statistical model used (e.g., two-way ANOVA).
- The term "ANOVA table created by comparing computed with tabular F values" is not scientifically appropriate.
- Include significance levels ($p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$) consistently.

7. Results

- Some results are repeated.
- Figures must be properly labeled and described (Figure 1, Figure 2, etc.).
- The explanation of significant vs non-significant parameters should be clearer.
- Remove subjective language such as "*ideal conditions*", "*greatest values*", etc.

8. Discussion

- The discussion is well supported but contains repetition.
- Needs clearer differentiation between:

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

hysiological responses,
morphological responses,
species-specific adaptations.

- Include more recent references where possible.
- Reduce redundancy with the Results section.

9. Conclusion

- The conclusion is appropriate but should be more concise.
- Highlight practical recommendations for agroforestry and nursery management.

Minor Revision

The study has scientific merit, but the manuscript must be thoroughly revised for clarity, structure, language, and completeness before being suitable for publication.