



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_67593
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative Assessment of the Agro-physiological Advantages of Upward Tapping in relation to the Downward Tapping of the GT 1 and PB 260 Rubber Clones [Hevea brasiliensis, Muell. arg. (Euphorbiaceae)] in Southwest 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	The manuscript Quantitative Assessment of the Agro-physiological Advantages of Upward Tapping in relation to the Downward Tapping of the GT1 and PB260 Rubber Clones of <i>Hevea brasiliensis</i> species is suitable for publication in the Journal of Experimental Agriculture International. The manuscript pointed the upward tapping system more advantaged for rubber production regardless of the rubber clone. The study showed an antagonism between rubber production and isodiametric growth of tree trunks due to competition between primary and secondary biomass, and the physiological parameters have no significant differences and presented well-balanced for both clones and treatments. The results are valid for publication and contribute to rubber production using the GT1 and PB260 clones. There are just minor points in the methodology that can be better elucidated for the comprehension of the experiment.	
Minor REVISION comments	Explain better in the methodology the analyse that clones were analysed separated and what program was used. The age of the experiment is 13 years but all trees have the same age? if not how it was considered for the analysis? regression analysis need be described also in the methodology.	
Optional/General comments		



SDI 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:	Camila Lucas Chaves
Department, University & Country	State University of Londrina, Brazil