

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_108542
Title of the Manuscript:	Textural and hydrodynamic parameters of soils under rubber plantation cover in CNRA Anguédédou plantations in southern Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, it is scientifically important for the major natural rubber-producing countries. The abbreviation “CNRA” should be written in full form or discarded. My suggestion is “Textural and hydrodynamic parameters of soil under rubber plantation cover in Anguededou area in southern Cote d’Ivoire”. The abstract appears to be adequate, however, the writing related to the treatments seems unclear. My suggestion is “The methodology involved selecting plantations of varying ages: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and 20-40 years, as well as a rubber plantation abandoned 8 years ago and a secondary forest”. <p>And also the full form of CNRA should be written followed by the abbreviation. The grammar used in the result statements must be in past tense, rather present tense.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the manuscript appears appropriate. The study's findings look scientifically correct. Some references are outdated. They should be replaced with updated articles published after the year 2000. The reference writings appear to be inconsistent and need to conform to the journal's format. <p><u>Additional suggestions/comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the introduction, the year of production for the 1.39 million tonnes of dry rubber needs to be specified, in the fourth sentence. In the fifth sentence, the statement “Cote d’Ivoire is the third largest producer in the world” is dubious. Thus, the author is suggested to cite some appropriate references for this. - Some terms such as “sheer size”, “singled out”, should be changed into proper formal ones. - The sentences about the objective statements, in the introduction, should be written in the past tense. - In the statement of the Choice of study sites, in the Method of Study, the writing appears to be unclear. My suggestion is “According to the biotope (rubber plantation, abandoned rubber plantations and forest) and the age of the rubber plantations, this study selected 12 plots. These included ten rubber plantations that were divided into four age categories: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and 21-40 years. Additionally, a secondary forest was also selected as a control, which was located in close proximity to these plantations. Furthermore, a rubber plantation that had been abandoned for more than eight years was also selected considered as a transition between the active plantations and the secondary forest.” - In the fifth sentence of the Data collection, the number “02” enclosed in the parentheses should be discarded. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- As an overall suggestion, it is obvious that most statements, specifically in the results, discussions, and conclusion, are grammatically incorrect. Some statements have to be in the past tense. They need corrections and improvement.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English writing of this article needs to be revised and improved.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

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