



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_46381
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Eucalyptus clones in Gangetic plains of Eastern Uttar Pradesh ,India
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Aiming to improve the manuscript some changes are necessary, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction: (1) The introduction needs to be improved by citing more literature data, in all manuscript only 5 references were used; (2) it may be improved adding also some comments about the relevant developments on eucalypt in other countries, it is very well established in the literature these gains in forest production as well as in chemical wood composition; (3) to add some comments regarding the planted area in the world as well as in India; (4) it would be very interesting to add the most interesting species in India for pulp/energy production considering the climate conditions and diseases; (5) it is necessary to use eucalypt or <i>Eucalyptus</i> (genus) in the text. Both are being used in the manuscript, it is necessary to standardize writing; (6) it would be interesting to add some comments about wood density, since this parameter is very important for the wood utilization;</li> <li>• Materials and methods: (1) it is necessary to identify each clone being studied (what is the specie for each one); (2) what is the specie of the control; (3) the equation used for obtaining the MAI could be added; (4) in general MAI is reported as “<i>volume per area per year</i>” (m<sup>3</sup>/ha/yr). Why this parameter was not used in this manuscript?</li> <li>• Results: (1) The discussion of the results is very poor and not satisfactory, needs to be improved; (2) it is impossible to follow the discussion of the authors, since only they know what is the species of each clone; (3) the discussion would be separated in two items, being first one the soil impact followed by the wood species; (4) In graphics the author needs to add the description of the axes;</li> <li>• There is no conclusion in the manuscript. The author needs to add a conclusion for the manuscript.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The raw material evaluated is very interesting, and really need many investigations for discovering new opportunities for producing wood, in special aiming a more rational utilization of biomass by the society. In this way it needs to be improved according to the comments above.	

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fernando José Borges Gomes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal Rural University, Brazil</b>