



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_56789
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytosociology, diversity and ecological groups of the adult tree component of a forest remnant in Pernambuco – Brazil
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	<p>Abstract: Omit headings of abstract i.e. aims, methods, result and conclusion rephrasing abstract as per authors guideline: For example <i>The main objective of this study is to characterize the floristic richness, phytosociological structure, and classify the ecological group of the adult tree component species in an area of ecological tension (Seasonal Forest and Caatinga) in Pernambuco - Brazil. The study was conducted in Atlantic Forest stretch in Pernambuco of Brazil from April 2019 to February 2020.Methods adopted for this study includes.....</i></p> <p>Correct scientific names with Italic format like -The Highest Importance Value observed from the species were <i>Guapira nitida</i>, <i>Buchenavia tetraphylla</i>, <i>Manilkara sp.</i>, <i>Byrsonima crassifolia</i> and <i>Sloanea obtusifolia</i>.</p> <p>Revise conclusion-considering your finding of the study correcting language errors.</p> <p>Introduction: Review of successional characteristics, secondary growth of species and invasion/ unwanted species is limited. Better to review more relevant studies.</p> <p>Material and Methods: Basis for establishment of plots, any reference? Not clear- For the classification of ecological groups, it was also researched in theses, dissertations, scientific articles, or ebooks</p> <p>Lacking reference-Table 1- Phytosociological parameters....</p> <p>Result and Discussion- Lacking explanation of Table 1 and Table 2 -Scientific names under this section are not in correct form-revise -Line 206-207-language errors i.e. The most important species of the analyzed fragment, -<i>Guapira nitida</i>, comes from the family Nyctaginaceae. It is an in..... Revise -Lacking analysis of diversity indexes Conclusion-not proposed strong conclusion as per the result delivered i.e... Still, it is necessary.....</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Language errors -Insufficient review of literature -Coherence between proposed methodology and result -Weak Discussion part -Improper representation of Scientific names -Proper referencing 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Follow-up authors guideline -Scientific justification -Similarity with abstract and conclusion towards methodology and result 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	Ramesh Prasad Bhatt
Department, University & Country	Institute of Ecology and Environment, India