

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_107975
Title of the Manuscript:	On-farm Tree Mulberry Geometry: Biochemical, Growth and Yield Analysis in The Traditional Areas of Sericulture.
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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for Seri-farmers and sericultural scientific community; It suggested the best spacing (8'x4') of mulberry trees for highest leaf yield and highest yearly gross economic return by comparing to diverse mulberry trees spacing practiced in the traditional areas of sericulture in India.</p> <p>2 The title is suitable.</p> <p>3 The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but it would be better if sentences could be clearer or more precise. It could be misunderstood just from the abstract that the 12'x12' is the best spacing the author suggested, as it has the highest total crude protein, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium content, and the 8'x4' spacing, on the other hand, has the highest leaf moisture content and the highest leaf yield without mentioning in the abstract the highest gross return per year per hectare.</p> <p>4 Yes.</p> <p>5 In Table 1 and Table 2, the superscripted letters were not explained about their meanings. Another question is that no statistical significances of the differences (of leaf moisture content etc.) between different mulberry tree spacings were found in the tables or manuscript. So, it's hard to say if the manuscript is scientifically correct at this point.</p> <p>6 More related references from other countries or regions are recommended.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English in the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wu Jinmei
Department, University & Country	JUST, SRICAAS, China