## Review Form 1.6

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_JAERI_94099** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Influence of tapping depth on rubber yield and tapping quality in rubber tree plantations in southeastern Côte d'Ivoire** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

**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 | - First, the whole manuscript must improve its English and follow academic writing rules.<br>- In the first paragraph of the Introduction section, it said "*Rubber tree cultivation, which started in the Amazon basin, current Brazil, two centuries ago, has now become an important economic activity throughout the world, because it generates enormous income*." In fact, *Hevea* rubber cultivation began at the end of the 19th century, around the 1890s and onwards.<br>- The introduction section should technically mention not only the role of tapping depth but also tapping frequency, tapping direction, tapping panel and biological functions of the cambium associated to yield potential as the related or supporting factors to the main concepts of this manuscript.<br>- In "Material and methods" section, it needs to describe the study year and experimental period. Also, it needs to describe the study site's geographic (coordinates) location.<br>- In section 2.2.1., in table 1, it needs to make sure a column title "the year of planting". The years in this column are too old. So, it might be the years of these clones produced by their institutes. It needs to cite some references for the data used in this table because the yields in the table seem too high.<br>- In table 2, the explanation (below the table) of the tapping frequency notations should be revised.<br>- In section 2.3.2.3., the chemical name of the stimulant "chloro-2-ethylphosphonic acid" is incorrect. The correct chemical name is "2-chloroethyl phosphonic acid".<br>- In section 2.3.2.4., it needs to make sure of the consistency of the abbreviations. I found some inconsistency in this sentence, "The transformation coefficient (CT) made it possible to switch from farm-gate weight (FW) to dry weight (DW), with TC = 0.56." The author(s) should explain why the transformation coefficient was 0.56, or cite a reference for that.<br>- In table 7, the explanation of the panel position notation is not clear. It did not explain "C" and "D". What do they stand for? | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | - The writing of the clones' names should be consistent and follow scientific rules. For example, NOT "PB217". The correct writing is "PB 217". NOT "IRCA41", it is "IRCA 41".<br>- In section 2.3.2.1., in the first paragraph, it said "*The trees were selected on the basis of the homogeneity of their girth at 1.70 m above the ground, …* ". It is suggested to describe the standard girth circumference at that height.<br>- In table 4, it had better explains the rank of the penalty levels "0 to 10". Which level is high, or which one refers low penalty? Also better to show a schematic diagram or figure explaining the differences between the treatments.<br>- In section 3.1.2., the unit "g/t" is incomplete. Normally, the average dry yield per tree is stated as "grams per tree per tap ("g/tree/tap" or "g/t/t"). I doubt the yields in this study were too high. It might be because of the TC value used in the calculation. Thus, explaining the TC value in the methodology is suggested | |
| **Optional/General** comments | - In the result and discussion section, I like to recommend exhibiting some realistic photos comparing the high and low tapping quality observed in the study so that readers would get more knowledge and awareness of the tapping standards.<br>- The study is interesting. However, the manuscript needs to improve in English writing and conceptual linkages with the result findings. And it needs to add some pictures. | |

**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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

## Review Form 1.6

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Zar Ni Zaw** |
| Department, University & Country | **Prince of Songkla University, Thailand** |