

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_102594
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling Height-Diameter of Trees in Mixed Forest Plantation Using Artificial Neural Network, Support Vector Regression and Empirical Nonlinear Models
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:

(<https://www.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. Because, it can minimize the challenges of tree height measurement especially in complex forest canopy that have occluded canopy. - No, it is not necessary to mention all used models in the title rather than in the methods. "Modelling Tree Height in Mixed Forest Plantation" is enough - No, the abstract of the article is not comprehensive. Because, the model do not indicate how much % of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. - It is scientifically correct but, the model validation technique is not clear to reader. So, in the methods of model validation and the data selection should be clear. In addition, the uncertainty of the model should be mentioned scientifically. - Modelling tree height is not necessary in all places that have not done before. Thus, the author should set the nobility of the research/ what makes this research special. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English language needs improvement in this manuscript. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tiegsti Hadush
Department, University & Country	Mekelle University, Ethiopia