

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_117368
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT SPACING LEVELS ON YIELD AND YIELD CONTRIBUTING CHARACTERS IN COCOA (Theobroma cacao L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Scientific studies that address the issue of plantation density in cocoa cultivation are of great relevance for improving productivity and profitability, however in this particular case it would be important to address the issue in greater depth, adding variables and more productive cycles, at least three years, to have sufficient information to assertively support the conclusions.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate</p> <p>3. The abstract gives clear information that allows the reader to introduce the topic discussed in the document.</p> <p>4. The structure of the document is appropriate and in accordance with the authors' guide.</p> <p>5. The information presented in the document appears insufficient to provide relevant results; it must be taken into account that it is a work carried out on a perennial crop in which one year of evaluations is not enough to scientifically support it. The conclusions show a description of results that does not correspond to a final status of the study. They must be redrafted.</p> <p>6. Most of the references are not recent and the total number of them is not enough to discuss the results.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript should be sent to an expert in scholar english to improve grammar and writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The materials and methods must describe whether the study was carried out for the same variety, and if so, mention which variety it is.</p> <p>It is recommended to carry out subsequent work to study the spatio-temporal effect on yields in plantations at different densities.</p> <p>In the phrase: 'while the lowest (314.06g) was in T7 (2.5m), similar to T7 (2.5m), which also registered 314.06g.' the wording of this section is confusing and even erroneous, it should be improved.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Carolina Hernández Hernández
Department, University & Country	Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, México