Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRAF_50971**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PRODUCTIVITY (VOLUME) ESTIMATES OF TEAK (Tectona grandis Linn F.) IN KANYA FOREST PLANTATION, KEBBI STATE, NIGERIA**
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	Lines 3-4: Modify the title of manuscript as **GROWTH AND VOLUME ESTIMATES OF TEAK (*Tectona grandis* Linn F.) IN KANYA FOREST PLANTATION, KEBBI STATE, NIGERIA** **ABSTRACT** The abstract requires restructuring from the following viewpoints: **Methodology:** The proposed methodology is not clear. The methodology requires precise specifications of the experimental design and statistical analyzes applied to variables. Provide outstanding information on correlation analysis between tree growth and yield Characteristics. **INTRODUCTION** Provide information on the distribution and production of ***Tectona grandis*** in Nigeria and its economic importance. **MATERIALS AND METHODS** **The Study Area:** It is recommendable to present the map of the study site. The methodology lacks an experimental design. Statistical analysis suggested on "Descriptive statistics (to summarize and group data into different diameter and height classes, basal area computation and volume estimation)" is confusing and requires higher specifications. There are many objections to the registration of bibliographic records where, the results were not properly interpreted and compared with the results of other authors. It is important that when the results are compared with the results of other authors, to mention the names of the authors followed by the number. **Conclusions:** This manuscript dose not present the conclusion, therefore is considered an unfinished work. References need to be restructured, adding (the) name (s) of the authors and same release dates. Registration of references should follow the relevant editorial guidelines.	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 20 change "According to [3, 1] Site" to "According to Forest Site Productivity [1] and Forest measurement, [3] site"	

| | Line 79: change "The basal area for each sampled tree was determined using the formula suggested by [6]" to "The basal area for each sampled tree was determined using the formula suggested by **name(s) of author(s),** [6]"..

Line 148: "Similar research was conducted by [12]," to "Similar research was conducted by **name(s) of author(s),** [12],"

Lines 157-158: "The mean basal area/ha reported in this study is lower than that obtained by [15, 16], mean volume/ha" to "The mean basal area/ha reported in this study is lower than that obtained by **add the names of authors,** [15, 16], mean volume/ha" | |
| **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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

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