



SDI Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJPSS_50007  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Estimation of Leaf Area by Linear Dimensions in Coffea dewevrei   |
| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | The linear dimensions of <i>Coffea dewevrei</i> leaves were determined in the study, leaf surface area was measured, and an attempt was made to select mathematical equations describing the analyzed traits and parameters. I have no methodological concerns regarding the process of searching for the optimal solution. However, I have doubts about research justification, i.e. the rationale for the study because – as stated by the Authors – separate measurements should be performed for each variety. It should be clearly specified what exactly the Authors intend to accomplish and what are the practical applications of the developed regression model. I agree that width values can be used to determine leaf surface area in a simple way, but how can this knowledge be translated into practice, for instance when estimating damage caused by pests? Are the collected leaf samples representative of the analyzed plant species? They were collected in one region only, whereas the Authors claim that the morphological traits of plants are affected by both weather and habitat conditions. Maybe the local soil and climate conditions are specific, and the characteristics of local plants differ significantly from the average values typical of the species, and therefore the obtained results can only be applied to the analyzed plants. |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | The manuscript has not been prepared very carefully – many symbols/marks inserted into the text become invisible in print. The Abstract is not compliant with the Journal's guidelines - it should have structured format, i.e. be organized into subsections. Several key words relating to dimensions should be added.<br>Figure 1 – dimension lines should be corrected – according to the technical drawing principles, dimension lines should be parallel to the measured segment, and witness lines should be perpendicular to the segment (if possible).<br>The readers can guess what the whiskers, rectangles and the thick line in Figure 3 denote, but the relevant explanations should be provided anyway. The Y-axis in Figure 3D is incorrectly labeled.<br>In the equations and numerical values in Tables 3 and 4, the number of significant digits should be reduced to 2, for greater clarity. Table 3 – the words in the header row should be translated into English. The explanations for symbols $\beta$ in the header row and footnote should be consistent.<br>The Conclusions section should be expanded, restating the major research findings and emphasizing the outcomes of the study. Just one short sentence suggests that the results are not important and the Authors do not have much to say.  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | The manuscript would benefit from editing by an English native speaker. When revising the manuscript and preparing subsequent articles, the Authors should pay more attention to formulating the research problem. The readers should be clearly and precisely informed what the Authors intend to accomplish and what theoretical or practical knowledge gaps their research fills. Since regression equations are presented, the Discussion section should include brief information about the equations developed by other authors, and their fitting to experimental results.   |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Zdzisław Kaliniewicz</b>                               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland</b> |