



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. Is there any economic purpose of the plant? To describe Add the copyrights of the images, even if they are the authors of the article Describe the researchers' access, Is it a particular area? If so, talk about the access authorization Describe the statistical analyzes used in the analysis When comparing variables with different amplitudes and magnitude by the mean, the standard error is not informative. Use coefficient of variation. 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 The plant's medicinal action has not been tested. Why is this the conclusion? to review Only 1/3 of references from last five years. Update</p>	Thank you for your valuable comments. We made changes which are yellow highlighted in revision.
Minor REVISION comments	See comments	See comments
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	