

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_108778
Title of the Manuscript:	Allometric aboveground biomass models for Northern Delhi Ridge Forest
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>1. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>2. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>3. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>4. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Somewhat 2. Yes 3. Abstract written as an introduction. Shorten 4. OK. 5. Difficult to say. The message is not clear. See optional comments 6. OK. They are actually too many. Make a selection.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>OK. But remove the abundant spurious spaces, as in "cross- validation", etc.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is not clear what it is the authors are doing in this work. This is probably due to the way it is written, which should be done with a little more care. All variables have to be explained even when they are 'obvious' (as in 'sp' in Fig. 1). I tried to follow the reasoning, but I got lost. Authors please explain better. The MAGB (please, write out all acronyms at least once; what is MAGB?) of Fig. 1 is determined how? Am I to understand it is not a measurement, but an estimation based on the data in Table 1? Explain (this should go in 2.3, instead of the trivial first sentence there). Is it $y = \text{Density} * (1/12) * \pi * H * D^2 * WD$? What is actually used in the fit for x and y? I am confused, moreover, since it looks like an <i>estimation</i> value is used for y in a fit. That is a strange way of doing things.</p> <p>Minor comments: "Kg" is kelvin-gram, "kg" is kilogram. Tables and figures numbered and placed in order of first mention. I guess also the references. Variables in <i>italics</i>. Ref 26 is in the text. Units in Fig. 1 are wrong. DH should have m^2, D^2H should have m^3. (and also remove "in") Some consistency in names of variables would be nice. Please, in future number the pages, so referees can more easily refer to them.</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:	Peter Stallinga
Department, University & Country	University of The Algarve, Portugal