

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_49490
Title of the Manuscript:	Amino acids content in different conditions economic plants from South Sinai as affected by different habitat conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

ns

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agre highlight that part in the mai
		his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper presents the influence of environmental conditions on the amino acid contents of two important plant species in South Sinai, Egypt. The study fits the scope of Asian Journal of Environment and Ecology. The findings of the paper are significant for the advancement of research. However, there are many issues and concerns that need to be addressed to improve on the quality of the paper. First of all, the title of the paper is not clear and very difficult to understand. Based on the content of the paper, I have proposed a simple and comprehensive title; "Amino acids content of economic plants from South Sinai as affected by different habitat conditions" Secondly, the language of the paper is very weak and there are many grammatical errors which make it very difficult to have a fluent read of the paper. In the whole text, I have done some corrections directly (highlighted) and I have indicated other places where the author needs to do some corrections (revisions), and if possible, with the help of a native English-speaking colleague. I have also corrected some technical issues such as the spellings of some amino acids that have been written wrongly throughout the text. E.g. aspartic acid, tryptophan, threonine, etc. The methodology is somewhat weak, especially in soil sampling/analysis and statistical analysis. In the results section, the author makes mention of physical properties (such as sand, silt, clay and soil water contents) but the methodology does not indicate how these parameters were obtained. Also, the author talks a lot of correlation among different amino acids and soil properties but the methodology does not indicate how correlation analysis was performed. Table 1 indicates the physical and chemical properties of soils but there are no units for those properties – thus it becomes very difficult to interpret the resultsAs concerning the characteristics of the two locations under study. Given that the study aims to understand the influence of environment on the chemical behavior of plant sp	nis/ner teedback here)
	 Provide some details of the study area such as the climate, hydrology, vegetation, soil types, etc. Please provide the methodology used for analysis of soil physical properties (soil texture or particle size distribution, and soil water content). Also indicate the soil-to-solution ratio used for measuring pH and EC. (e.g. soil:water ratio of 1:2.5, 1:5, etc.) In Table 1, indicate the units of the various parameters and also indicate the units used in brackets for sand, silt and clay contents. Whenever you mention that there is a significant correlation, you must indicate the level of significance or probability level alongside the correlation coefficient (e.g. r = 	
	 ???, p < 0.05, p < 0.01, etc.). Therefore you should provide a table showing results of correlation analysis with the probability level used. 	

reed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nanuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
	The concerns raised in this paper must be addressed in order to make it scientifically sound and fit for publication.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed
		highlight that part in the manus
		his/her feedback here)
	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Georges Kogge Kome
Department, University & Country	University of Dschang, Cameroon

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write