



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_13067
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An understory comparison of the exotic <i>Phellodendron amurense</i> Rupr. (RUTACEAE) and adjacent native canopy species in an urban and suburban woodland</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●Rearrange theoretical foundation for the goals</li> <li>●Details on obtaining the data were partially omitted</li> <li>●No mention of the statistical test used</li> <li>●If the test was one way Anova is incorrect</li> <li>●The statistical hypothesis test is in trouble, definitely</li> <li>●Invalidates the work</li> <li>●Missing a posteriori tests</li> <li>●The results must separate discussion</li> <li>●The authors do not explain the results obtained</li> <li>●The discussion is poor</li> <li>●Lack as a standard writing test results</li> </ul>	<p>I believe I have corrected these points through earlier reviewer's comments.</p> <p>Statistical tests have been clarified, there is no comparison between sites, only within sites. I have made this clearer within the text.</p> <p>The results and discussion have been separated as described by the journal.</p>