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)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	In this paper authors adopted a method to select plus trees for flower production is described and named as a crown-area-based method. Both individual-based and crown-area-based methods were used to select plus trees for *Camellia impressinervis, a golden camellia; its yellow flowers have been widely used* to treat sore throat and diarrhea, and to prevent cancers. Flower production of 21 concerned individuals was compared to the population mean and it was generated as a percentage. The population mean of the individual-based method is the mean of production of 21 trees as mean production/tree. It is concluded that crown-area-based method is better in selecting plus trees for flower purpose, as it considers the crown area which is known as a productive part of a tree to form flowers. The study is very interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly. **Following Explanations are needed-** **Page 2, Line 61: 2.MATERIALS AND METHODS** *is to be replaced as:* **2.MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY** **Page 6, Lines 185-196: 5.CONCLUSION** *is to be re-written with point wise.*	Thank you for your valuable comments. We made changes which are yellow highlighted in revision.
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is interesting and structured properly, but need to be improvised linguistically. *The review manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / comments.*	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	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)*	