

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_80367
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolution of the rate of live and tapped trees of Hevea brasiliensis clones, Muell. Arg. the first 15 years of plantation establishment
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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to read the study "Evolution of the rate of live and tapped trees of Hevea brasiliensis clones, Muell. Arg. the first 15 years of plantation establishment". The study is in a position to be published because it brings news about the evolution of the rate of living trees used in rubber tree planting during the 15 years analyzed by the authors. However, some suggestions aim to strengthen the understanding, debate and logic of the study.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The introduction has strong importance and justification for the study, but it does not clearly and objectively indicate the problem studied. I see that this failure compromises the quality of the work, as the problem allows us to demonstrate the need and importance of alleviating the wear and tear and imbalance of a given problem situation.</p> <p>Material and Method</p> <p>Material and method are incomplete. I noticed in this section the presentation of the research subject and specific procedures. However, what is the method of this study? Is it descriptive, association or association with interference? It is essential to clearly leave the method and intellectual strategy to validate the study. Another missing point refers to data analysis. How was the data analyzed? Qualitative, quantitative or quali-quantitative approach? It is important to make clear to the reader the logic that drives the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Note: In general terms, the work has quality, since the authors made an effort to present the contributions and novelties of the study in a logical way. These are my contributions for the moment.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Josimar da Silva Freitas
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Amapá, Brazil