SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_49415**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Estimation Leaf Area of Leaflets of Acacia mangium Willd. by means linear dimensions**
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	The authors propose a non-destructive sampling to estimate leaf area of A. mangium based on leaf length and width. Overall, topic is interesting and the manuscript falls within the scope of International Journal of Plant & Soil Science. Tree leaves being a dual pathway for C assimilation through photosynthesis and water loss by transpiration, it is usually important to determinate leaf area on living tree. Hence, the modelling exercise proposed by the author attempt to solve this issue, which is great. Although the idea of using regression models is good. Unfortunately, I have a great concern about the readability and focus of the manuscript. In addition, the authors have provided additional insight e.g. by regressing OLA against L, W, and LW, respectively, which are to my view not necessary owing to the objective of the paper. The paper is poorly written, which makes it difficult to understand. I invite the authors to thoroughly rework the paper for clarity and English language. Other sections depend on it. Because the dataset along with the idea of doing regressions analyses are good, the authors have a chance to make a good paper out of it. Therefore, I would recommend major revision and hopefully they will adequately address the concern raised in this paper in their revised version.	
Minor REVISION comments	Readability and flow of the paper should be worked.	
Optional/General comments	I recommend the authors to have their manuscript edited for English language.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Venceslas Goudiaby*
Department, University & Country	*University of Quebec at Montreal, Canada*