Editorial Comments

9/13/2013

Decision: Make Corrections and Resubmit Again.

Comments are below:

1. In the result section of the abstract adds'by' as following: …… Bortrac fertilizer increased productivity by 28%.
2. You have not mentioned anything in the results in abstract about income and poverty reduction therefore you can't bring that in conclusion in abstract. Please understand conclusion is derived from results. Please change your conclusion based on the results or bring cost benefit analysis in the result in abstract. Similar is true for the whole paper.
3. 3. Please see line 31, 32, and 33 should read –"Despite the long history of extensive planting and use of tea oil camellias, its productivity and quality remain low [8, 9, 10] in Vietnam especially with low income households. Technical supports toward intensive planting tea oil camellias are required for raing production and income."
4. Rewrite the sentences in line 33, 34 and 35. It is too long. Write in 2 sentences and in 20-25 words per sentence.
5. Make changes in the line 37and 39.
6. In line 51 mention some of the names of the villages, towns that you conducted this study - readers is not going to look in the map for $19^0 16'$N and $105^0 23'$E addresses.
7. Line 65 - What were the criteria for selecting 230 trees, was selection process random, or other approach.
8. Line 76 - Why data were collected in regularly at 9, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, 72 months. Any technical reasons - describe here.
9. Line 83 - Twenty ml Bortrac fertilizer was selected to mix with water. Is there any technical reasons for 20ml- cite references if someone have done similar study. If it is the researcher's choice what technical reason was there for this choice- does it affects tree better than other doses- for instance why not 30 ml?
10. Also mention what is the usual life of the tree.
11. Method 2.2.2 and 2.2.3- why there is long time disparity between Bortracfertilizer spray and stem/branch thinning and fertilizing. If you collected the data from people or experiment station then mentioned that the thinning data was collected from which source. Is that usual time for the research? You did thinning in 1998 -200 and did experiment with Bortrac fertilizer in 2006 - why?
12. Describe the relationship of time between thinning at 1998-200 and experiment at 2006-2007 and cost benefit in 2012. Why so long for this research. Is that due to natural growth of the tree or fruiting time or even optimum fruiting time? Describe fruit age, natural fruiting time etc.
13. What is this U$D currency? Is that US$? Describe the currency as United States Dollars (US$), if it is in US$.
14. Your readers are not always agriculturist. Readers can be planners, administrators and people in other field. Therefore, describe first time in the paper all abbreviation such as NPK, CBA, BTF etc. You can write Nitrogen, Phosphorous, Potash (NPK - 5:10:3).
15. Line 162 - You said significantly increased productivity by 28% - was statistical method used to determine this significance? Your data analysis does not show that. It shows only graph? You can't say significant without statistical analysis. Please show the significance like in Table 2 as you said with t-test.

16. Line 197, 198, and 199 - You said "They may get higher net income as 1,791 U$D ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$ for not applying silvicultural techniques. If applying treatment as stem/ branch thinning and fertilizing, annual net income may increase to 2,082 U$D ha^{-1} using treatment BTF1, to 2,374 U$D ha^{-1} in treatment BTF2, and to 2,426 U$$D^{-1}$ ha in treatment BTF3 (Table 3)."
17. What are the sources of date here you said they may get higher net income…..is that your assumption? You can't use your own assumption - use valuable source of information or market analysis. This is research and you are doing cost-benefit analysis. Assumption will deteriorate the trust for research and data. You need to understand that Ministry of Agriculture in Vietnam may make policy based on this. You can't mislead the readers. You can say 'may increase net income" in discussion section but not in the result without valuable source of information. Discussion is the place where you have leverage to mention your thoughts, assumptions and arguments. But you can't assume a number for net income even in discussion - what is your base for this assumptions.
18. In line 247 -248 you said cost of their own labor-you have to mention the cost of labor in your cost – benefit analysis. You can't assume some numbers. There must be market analysis or cost for minimum labor by the government of Vietnam.
19. While describing cost –benefit analysis- you did not mention the planting time, overhead cost of the land and labor until fruiting and then harvesting cost and then income. Describe the relationship between them from valuable source including your research data. If harvesting cost and other cost are not your research concern then please write keeping other things constant, we compared difference between traditional methods and new methods using this research, the following differences were found in the cost and income.
20. Line 201 - it was much different between BTF2 and BTF1 (16%; Table 3). Was this difference per hectare, per ton, what is the unit here?
21. In line 247 -248 you said cost of their won labor-you have to mentioned the cost of labor in your cost – benefit analysis. You can't assume some numbers. There must be market analysis or cost for minimum labor by the government of Vietnam.
22. Line- 127 - Write the heading only results and in line 208 write separate heading as discussion. This is good way. If this is the style of the journal – then that is ok the way you have done – Otherwise do as advised.
23. Line 225-228- You did not mention anything about organic manure in result and in your research – therefore how you are comparing between inorganic and organic in discussion. Discussion is only based on the results and comparing your data with similar research. If Bortrac fertilizer is organic fertilize then describe in the method as organic fertilizer.
24. Line 217, 218, and 219- Please put that in recommendation- "…therefore much attention should be given to disease control, longevity of grafted shoots, water and nutrient uptake ability of grafted stumps *etc*."
25. In scientific writing you can't write etc. because facts are based on research. What readers should understand about etc.
26. Line 254 -You said " Even quite high annual net income from old plantation of *C. sasanqua* (Table 3)" – what are the basis for saying quite high net income. – the term quite high can mislead readers. Please say by percent increase by different methods.
27. Line 260- 61- You said "which is cheap and requires no techniques for application by all growers." What does this mean "cheap and requires no techniques". Describe what is 'cheap' means and what is 'technique' means here. Are you talking about oil extraction methods then say that otherwise techniques

and cheap does not make any sense to readers. Is cheap means in terms of cost or in terms of technology?

28. Line 269-the first word should be 'oil' not 'Soil'.
29. Line 270 – sentence should read - ……land areas suitable…….
30. Line 274 - delete the word sustainably.
31. Line 278 – delete the word – propaganda – it makes different sense to different people – use suitable word here.
32. Line 279- 282: Put his word in recommendation "Therefore, a national program on development of tea oil camellias focusing on above-mentioned issues should be soon considered and put into action, which is expectation of growers for tea oil camellia development, income improvement, and poverty reduction".
33. You need to develop one spate headings for Recommendation and put the sentences I advised under that.
34. Line 296-297 – This goes to recommendation- " …initial financial and technical supports from Government for establishing tea oil camellias plantation are required".
35. Line 299-302 also goes to recommendation –"Small-scaled planted areas and instability of market are two biggest issues in developing tea oil camellia in Vietnam. The problems can only be solved by actions of Government other than growers themselves. Therefore, a more intensive study on tea oil plantation to help solve small-scaled planted areas and market instability should be conducted in soon future".
36. Line 293-297 – you did not talk about this in results therefore you can't say "if it happens case" like you said this in conclusion " If a four-person household owns a hectare of tea oil camellias and applies the best intensive techniques, annual income of 2,426 U$D is high enough to lead them out of poor/very poor household classification. However, initial financial and technical supports from Government for establishing tea oil camellias plantation are required".

37. Conslcuion is based on solid facts from results and there is no place for if case …like I mentioned in point 36.