



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_49729
Title of the Manuscript:	A Method to Select Plus Tree for Flower Purpose in Forestry
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The manuscript addresses a method of field evaluation, both practical and operational. It's well written, deserves to be published. However, some points should be better clarified, see in the comments.</p> <p>Also, a Principal Components Analysis from the data in Table 1 is indicated to summarize the data presented and to facilitate the reader's understanding.</p> <p>Change all words that are already in the title.</p> <p>Is there any economic purpose of the plant? To describe</p> <p>Add the copyrights of the images, even if they are the authors of the article</p> <p>Describe the researchers' access, Is it a particular area? If so, talk about the access authorization</p> <p>Describe the statistical analyzes used in the analysis</p> <p>When comparing variables with different amplitudes and magnitude by the mean, the standard error is not informative. Use coefficient of variation.</p> <p>In Figure 3, add standard deviation bars in the columns to compare. Or use a t-test or Mann-whitney (depending on Normality) to compare the results to par</p> <p>The plant's medicinal action has not been tested. Why is this the conclusion? to review</p> <p>Only 1/3 of references from last five years. Update</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable comments. We made changes which are yellow highlighted in revision.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>See comments</p>	<p>See comments</p>
Optional/General comments		

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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	