

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_112544</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Growth and Biomass models for three fast-growing tree species under High-density Plantation</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

[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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of</b></p>	<p>Definitely. The manuscript provides information on the growth and biomass models for Poplar, Eucalyptus, and Casuarina trees under high-density plantations. The authors performed a randomized block design and determined which tree species demonstrated the best growth among all treatments. My worry is that this manuscript may not fit the theme(s) of the journal.</p> <p>The authors may still improve the title of the manuscript. The authors may directly include the name of the model used in the study, such as the linear regression model. As I read the manuscript, I noticed that only the linear regression model was utilized. Hence, why the use of the term "models?"</p> <p>The authors should revise the abstract for coherence. The authors should first clearly explain what T2, T5, and T8 mean. Unless they remove these. The abstract mentioned that the height or girth of the trees can serve as independent variables. However, these variables can also be considered "dependent variables." The independent variable in this study could be the spacing employed, light availability, water, or soil quality.</p> <p>This author also recommends improving the grammar of the abstract.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The authors can still write the introduction in an extensive manner. Although the authors clearly mentioned the rationale of the study. The authors may also include the characteristics of the trees used in the experimentation and if, indeed, these trees have economic value for timber sources, particularly at the study site.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authors should explicitly discuss why the three (3) tree species were selected.</li> <li>• Include the references used for the equations.</li> <li>• What are the bases for the selection of the trees for stem biomass? The authors did not explicitly mention the sampling technique, which may indicate "biasedness."</li> <li>• Explain what "biomass expansion factor" is and its significance in the study.</li> <li>• Under the "Statistical analysis" subsection, what do the authors mean by "twenty-seven distinct equations?"</li> <li>• This reviewer suggests that a map of the study area and an illustration of the randomized block design be provided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This author highly recommends the improvement of the grammar. It's hard to understand some of the statements in the manuscript, particularly under the "Results and Discussion" section.</li> <li>• In Table 2, what do the parameters "a," "b," and "c" represent?</li> <li>• This section only presents the results. There were NO DISCUSSIONS.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion was concise. However, the authors should include the reasons why they came up with those findings. The authors should include the reasons behind their findings, as well as the implications and further recommendations.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p>additional references, please mention in the review form. <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Partly. The authors should really consider the above recommendations. This reviewer is unsure if there's already an existing study almost similar to this. If there are, how does this study differ?  The references are recent. However, this reviewer recommends that references be added to the list.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Partly. The authors SHOULD consult a language expert.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This reviewer believes that this manuscript is highly leaning towards "wood science" studies. The authors should improve the manuscript, and it should best fit the theme(s) of the journal.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Ronnel C. Nolos</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>College of Environmental Studies, Marinduque State University, Philippines</b></p>