Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRAF_110891**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Moisture Harvesting Structures Enhance Survival and Growth Performance of Multi-Purpose Tree Seedlings in Semi-Arid Hillsides of Tigray, Ethiopia**
Type of the Article	**Opinion Article**

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. Yes, the manuscript addresses a significant environmental issue—vegetation cover degradation in low rainfall areas of Ethiopia—and proposes a practical solution through the evaluation of moisture harvesting structures. This research is relevant to the scientific community as it contributes valuable insights into mitigating deforestation and promoting tree seedling survival in moisture-stressed environments. **2.** The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, detailing the problem, objectives, methodology, and key results. It effectively summarizes the research, making it accessible to readers. **Consider a slight revision for conciseness (<250 words) without sacrificing crucial information.** **3.** The manuscript appears scientifically correct, employing standard research methodologies and statistical analyses. However, **specifying the type of ANOVA used for Split plot design**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The content is clear, and the ideas are effectively communicated. **However, there are a few areas where minor adjustments could enhance precision or flow, as mentioned in the manuscript. There are a few grammatical issues that needs to be addressed.**	
Optional/General comments	1. Review the entire document for **grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors**. **2.** Use the **appropriate symbols and units wherever necessary** 3. Provide more in-depth interpretation of the results. For instance, discuss the practical implications of the findings for land restoration efforts or how the results contribute to existing knowledge.	

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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Clara Manasa P A**
Department, University & Country	**Keladi Shivappa Nayaka University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, India**