SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRAF_51633**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Agronomic performance of Hevea brasiliensis Muell. Arg. clone IRCA 331 grown in Southwestern 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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		
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract Mentioning the statistical analysis applied to variables of isodiametric growth of the trunk, rubber yield, trees stand latex physiological parameters. Introduction Provide information on the origin and distribution *Heaea brasiliensis,* its annual production and economic importance of plants. Material and Methods Experimental site Change "(5°40' North, 6°43'West)" to "(5°40' North latitude, 6°43'West longitude)" We recommend adding to the results of "**figure 1:** Evolution of the number of tapped trees during the experiment" the statistical support (standard deviations).	
Optional/General comments	In summary, the present work has been well structured from the point of view of methodology Experimental design and treatments has been well presented. The results on agronomic parameters (dry rubber yield, stand evolution, Isodiametric growth of tree trunks) as well as the results on Physiological parameters of the latex and Sensitivity to tapping panel dryness (Dry rubber content, Inorganic phosphorus content, Sucrose content, Thiol group contents and Sensitivity to tapping panel dryness) were properly interpreted, discussed and compared with similar results from other authors. In general terms, taking into account the points above, the publication of this manuscript is recommended with minor revisions.	

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)*	

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Rahim Foroughbakhch Pournavab***
Department, University & Country	***Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Mexico***