



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_32669
Title of the Manuscript:	Nursery performance of male clones of poplar (<i>Populus deltoides</i> Bartr.) under temperate conditions of Kashmir Valley
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	Valuable information that can benefit from: 1. More conciseness through considerable editing – e.g., sentence on Line 29 now “The estimates ... that there are...” could be shortened to “There are...” 2. Presenting results with appropriate precision, e.g., Line 11 – 283.54 cm should be 284 cm. 3. Not frequently repeating #s in text that are in Tables. 4. Clarifying clones – e.g., is W-22 a clone of one Wimco seedling? 5. If so, there may be merit in statistically comparing the 15 “clones” by origins of Texas, Wimco, Haldwani, J&K 6. Clarifying how the 150 cuttings/clone were deployed – e.g., 50 cuttings/rep, plot configuration within a rep? 7. If the #s in the tables are maxima (as suggested in Lines 90 and 91), the data need to be reprocessed to generate means. 8. Tables 1 and 2 could be combined into a landscape format version. 9. “... appropriate statistical analysis” in Line 70 is not evidenced in Table 1 or 2. 10. Check References format for consistency, spelling, abbreviations, and style. 11. “Nickles” should be “Nikles” 12. What's the purpose of “S. No.” in Tables 1 and 2? 13. Add “No of Trees” column in these tables to provide evidence for comparing means. 14. Add ages for traits in Tables if these are not all 2 years. For example, what was the tree age for specific gravity?	Feedback as per the Reviewer's comments : 1. Lines have been shortened where ever required. 2. & 3. Results have been presented with appropriate precision in the text. 4. & 5. Clones have been compared by origin while discussing the selection of best and potential male clones. Pertinent to mention here that planting material of all the clones (except local) was procured from the already existing established tree at Wimco seedlings. 6. Deployment of cuttings verified. 7. Data reprocessed and means have been generated. 8. Table 1 and 2 has been combined into a landscape format version and the corrections in the text done accordingly. 9. Line 70 clarified. 10. References format for consistency, spelling, abbreviations, and style checked. 11. Nickles verified and replaced with Nikles. 12. Since the tables have been combined now and the S. No. depicts the total no. of clones under study. 13. The reviewer is not clear as to what is required. A sample of 10 plants/replicate/clone has been extracted for obtaining raw data and the same was later analysed and presented in tabular form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	15. Figure 1 and Table 3 duplicate information. Suggest deleting Figure. 16. Table 3 could even be part of the new Table 1. 17. Is there basis for weighting all traits equally in the ranking? For example, why use both fresh and dry plant weight? 18. Can the ranks be compared statistically in order to state that L-34 (TC), L-34, and 65/27 are best? 19. How is LC-34 (TC) different from LC-34?	14. Since this study deals with nursery evaluation and all the traits are of two years age therefore there is no need to add ages. The same has been mentioned in the beginning of material and methods. 15. Figure 1 has been deleted to avoid duplicate information given in Table 3 (now table-2). 16. Merging of Table 3 with new table 1 may be little confusing so far its title is concerned. 17. The clones vary in the content of moisture stored in them therefore it gives more accuracy by using both fresh as well as dry weight. 18. The ranks have been calculated from the overall values of all the parameters combined. Therefore these cannot be compared statistically. 19. As stated above at 4 & 5 the planting material of all the clones (except local) was procured from the already existing established tree at Wimco seedlings. The names have been authenticated by Wimco authorities by issuing certificate in this regard. The difference between L-34 and L-34(TC) is that the former has been brought from its origin and lateral has been developed at Wimco.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		