



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_29798
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimating of area and dry mass of cashew leaf: Effect of tree position within a plantation
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	There is no mention of aspects regarding the site. The author only indicates a location base on azimuth, cardinal directions. I assume since they suggest more sunlight incidence in the southern location that there must be some aspect, i. e., there is south-facing, north-facing, etc. With the plantation only 3.5 ha in size and the reported result differences based on south, north, east, west, then there must be an aspect influence. The divided the canopy vertically into 3 parts, but no mention of what defined the lower, middle, upper part of the canopy Authors keep saying that their results are consistent with other studies, but they never say what the species are in those studies that they refer to. They sate that the leaf area they find is consistent with Archak et al (2003) who reported a leaf size of 87.2 cm² and range of 51.4 – 174.3 cm². Certainly with that range in size there is ample room for consistency, but they never state the species. Is the species studied by Achak et al cashew? If not, how can you say it is consistent when different species have greatly different leaf morphology? The use of nebulous statistical language is abundant. In regard to the models, what is meant by “predict efficiently”, “generally satisfactory”, “quality prediction”, models are “less good”, “poor predictive qualities”, and	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	“intermediate results”. They state the all dry mass models “predict efficiently” the dry mass, but that the models have “poorer fitting quality”. It may be the language used, but it seems contradictory.... this needs further explaining. It is unclear whether the authors actually tested for significant differences in the means of the leaf characteristics by plantation location, and if they tested the model coefficients to determine if any of the models could be combined. They stated that they used the Newman-Keuls test, which is often used as a post-hoc test whenever a significant difference between three or more sample means has been revealed by an analysis of variance. Were differences found? It is not clearly stated. If differences were found, it should be indicated in table 2. I have marked several notes on the manuscript	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I have indicated a number of editorial corrections and comments on the manuscript	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roger A. Williams
Department, University & Country	School of Environment and Natural Resources, The Ohio State University, USA