

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_84817
Title of the Manuscript:	Site-specific allometric equations for biomass prediction of Moringa oleifera Lam. in the northern zone of Cameroon
Type of the Article	Research paper

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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The paper is to elaborate the use of site-specific allometric equation to predict the biomass of <i>Moringa oleifera</i>. The topic is interesting and informative. The structure of the paper is well-written. However, the author needs to pay attention on:</p> <p>Introduction: Please reviewer the grammatical and the structure of the sentence</p> <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If your method is a modified method of someone’s else work, it is better to put the word “adopted”.• In section 2.2.2, I presume you could make a table on the data collection you have made this far. Label the table accordingly.• For better presentation, give some space and put Equation 1. For example: $WC (\%) = ((FM-DM)/DM) * 100$ (1)• What is the DM and FM? I doubt the explanation of the acronym is written in the manuscript.• Restructure the numbering system of your equation.• In section 2.3 data analysis, why there are two words of “where”? Please check.• In section 2.3. “The closer it is to 1, the better the model.” Do you have any reference for this?• In section 2.3, Give some features of the R Studio Software. What is the benefit or limitation of using this. <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compare your result to reference number [54]. What was the previous findings and how it compares to your result? <p>Discussion: Since author are using Site-specific allometric equations for the biomass prediction, what are the input variables and output variables? I would suggest, the author put them in the one sentence so that the reader may easily captured the variables that may influence the prediction result. If necessary, put in the table. Also, in this discussion section, the author could elaborate how the relationship between the input and output variable</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The grammatical and the structure of the sentence has been reviewed" by English-speaking people.2) We have corrected in the text that the "the destructive method has been adopted"3) The spaces in equation 1 have been inserted4) We mentioned in the text that FM is the fresh mass and DM the dry mass. However FM has been replaced by WM which means wet mass and which is more explicit5) The equation numbering structure has been restructured6) In section 2.3 data analysis, the extra where has been removed7) The reference of “The closer it is to 1, the better the model” has been added8) The characteristics, some advantages and limitations of rstudio have been given9) Reference 54 has been replaced by reference 56, author whose work was more explicit10) The input variables are represented by the different biomasses (leaves, branches, trunks, aerial and underground biomasses). Output variables are represented by dendrometric parameters (height and diameter at breast height). They have been materialized in the various tables of allometric models
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Check the spelling of “socio- eological ”.	
Optional/General comments	The use of the first person singular and plural must be avoided.	

Comment [k1]: Put citation. Is there any reference for this?

Comment [k2]: Check the spelling

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	