

Editorial Comments

(September 22, 2013)

Decision:

Change some of these minor corrections that I have advised below and resubmit. I would like to leave the decision to Managing Editor for publication after making sure all the corrections that I suggested have been included in the paper. Thank you for the opportunity to read this paper.

Suggestions

1. This is good research and I want this paper to be published in this journal. It will give much new perspective about tea oil camellia in Vietnam to ministry of forestry/agriculture, policy makers, and extension agents.
2. Authors has done very good job addressing my previous advice to make the paper readable. I appreciate that. However, there are still some minor changes needed and authors have not addresses them such as the reasons for selecting 230 trees and some others (see comments below in detail).
3. Please understand very well that you are not writing for yourself. You are the researcher and you know your research better than anybody. But you are writing for others to read the outcomes of your experiment. Therefore keep that in your mind. It is important because if other people in Vietnam or in other countries would like to conduct similar research your paper should be suffice to understand the research process for them.
4. **Result section of the Abstract:**
Please change this sentence as:
Cost-benefit analysis indicated that by applying different intensities of stem/branch thinning and fertilizing to 29-year-old plantation, **profit margin** increased from US\$ 502 to as much as US\$ 549 ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for growers selling dry seeds as final product. Meanwhile, it increased from US\$ 1,791 to US\$ 2,426 / hectare / year by extracting oil for final product.
5. Throughout the article follow the same consistency in terms of writing money. For example: US\$ 502 – **Do not write 502 US\$** - this is not the way of writing in scientific literature. Please change throughout the paper as I advised.
6. **Conclusion of the Abstract:**
Please change the syntax as:

There is a potentiality of growing tea oil camellia with the increased profit of as much as 2,426 US\$ ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for 29-year-old plantation by applying intensive silvicultural approach.

7. Line 35-36 the sentence should read like this:

Meanwhile, oil productivity of intensive tea oil camellia plantations in China is found to have been as high as 1,000 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ [11].

8. The line 40-44 – The objectives may be stated in a better way rather than stating in terms of silvicultural approaches. There is a possibility that the fourth one related to CBA also appears like a silvicultural approach. It is understandable now but may be even better if they change it to objectives of research.

This paper addressed silvicultural approaches in terms of (1) changing canopy of 36-year-old plantation by grafting, (2) using Bortrac fertilizer for promoting fruiting by spraying to canopy, (3) stem/ branch thinning and fertilizing for improving oil productivity and quality, and (4) cost-benefit analysis for applied silvicultural approach in tea oil camellia plantation in north Central of Vietnam.

9. "In this study, doses applied were much focused than timing": I am not very clear about what authors mean by this.

I am assuming that the treatments in second experiment were based on a thorough review of literature. It is not very clear if similar treatment data exists for fruit trees. Please clarify that in the paper.

10. Line 50-59: the selection of study site:

Please describe why this site was selected for study. The reason can be such as -lower income households growing tea are living in that area and your focus was for lower income household or that is the only tea growing area in Vietnam or only in that area 29 year plantation available or selected randomly from among the tea growing area or selected purposively because of donors project in that area so donors wanted to conduct research in that site or many other reasons.

11. Line 61 – change the subheading 2.2 Species description to Description of Tea Oil Camellia Tree.

12. The description in line 63 -71 is very good and give readers an idea of what the tea oil camellia tree is all about. Thank you authors – good job here.

13. At the end of line 78, please add the sentence - **This is the limitation of this experiment.**
14. In line 75-78, you already described the availability of the budget is the limitation of conducting this experiment at different times. Therefore you do not need the sentence in the line 96-97: **Such measured time intervals were based on budget availability other than technical reasons.** Delete this line.
15. In line 83 you said: A 36-year-old plantation of a household including 230 trees of C. sasanqua were selected. **But as my previous request you did not describe why 230 plants were selected and with how many households.** You can say like randomly selected 230 trees with certain number of households or the selection of tree and household was purposive for this research based on donor's request or number of lower income household selected purposively with 230 plants they planted - something like that. .
16. In line 217 and 219 – the **profit** increased – NOT the **benefit**. Change benefit to profit throughout the paper. Benefit and profit are two different things; you are talking here profit in terms of money.
17. In Table 3 – please write annual profit NOT benefit. Then also change ABO to probably APO otherwise describe the reasons to the readers in the manuscript why not profit than benefit. You may have to change the abbreviation at the bottom of the Table as well.
18. I suggest only the heading **Conclusions** in Line 314. Then for line 327 – 33, a separate heading as **6. Recommendations**. This will clearly give direction for specific action needed by ministry of forestry/ agriculture to make the old tea oil camellia orchard profitable especially for low income household.

Editor's Details:

Nav Ghimire

University of Wisconsin –Extension, USA