



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_13067
Title of the Manuscript:	An understory comparison of the exotic Phellodendron amurense Rupr. (RUTACEAE) and adjacent native canopy species in an urban and suburban woodland

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The manuscript has improved considerably. There are a few things that need to be addressed &/or commented upon & revised. They are as follows: Abstract: One of your sites is in Connecticut, which is not that close to NYC; You present t-values – is this t_{critical} or a typo? i.e., do you mean p-value? L24 ‘economic’ not ‘economical’ L26 unclear, please revise L159-163 This is a strange way to present CI - just show ±4.1 or whatever the value may actually be. How you present CI isn’t the same above & below the mean value... so something is amiss..(i.e., 19.29-15.2=4.09 while 23-19.29 = 3.71) Same issues before with ‘t’ vs ‘p’ value L172-175 Thus, you shouldn’t even speak of them differeing at all.. they are <u>similar</u>. What would be of interest is to tell the reader if the actual species under canopy differed. Thus, impacts of invasive species may not be associated with density, but potential differences in the actual species that can establish under canopy. This can potentially have impacts on vegetation dynamics across the lanscape over time if more <i>P.amurense</i> establish throughout the forest blocks in the future; i.e., comuunity composition may change to favour species that can establish under <i>P. amurense</i> vs those that cannot. Your tables in your appendix actually show some potential impacts; i.e., there are a number of species establishing under native canopy only, as well as a number of species establishing under an exotic canopy only. This information could (should) be highlighted & then the message above about potentially changing forest composition over time could be explored.. L178-182 You could better state these results more in function of the <i>ecology</i> rather than the statistics. Please revise. L193 Is this supposed to be a heading? If not, this is a sentence fragment.. please revise L197-199 CI format not conventional L200-202 Again, the stats aren’t what is of interest; rather, the ecology is what needs to explained & the stats should just be used to support your claims. As it is, it seems the reverse is highlighted.. L210 As above about subsection heading – please make it more explicit that this is what it is.. L212-216 CI format needs revising L245-246 Refer to your appendices here. It may be beneficial to explain your results a little further. Looking at your tables it is clear that a few species were found only under native canopy & a few only under exotic tree cover... perhaps if you determine which lifeforms (if any) are woody &	Connecticut is next to NY. It is less than 10 miles between the city line and state of Connecticut. The city itself is over 450 sq miles. Yes, that was a typo; I forgot to change the t to a p when I redid the analysis. I have put all the statistical reporting for these t tests in the same format that is seen in other articles in the science domain journals. L24, yes, I changed that. L26, I have revised it to be clearer. L159, I used bootstrapping to obtain the confidence intervals, which will not always show the evenness on both sides that, are found with other methods. I added text to make this cleat L 172-175 Agreed, I have taken that out and replaced it. I have added a very brief note regarding species differences between the two sites, however, I feel that the data presented here is not very conclusive in that regard. There is current work being done to look at this aspect in a more extensive manner, and examine factors that may facilitate or inhibit the success of particular species. I have modified the appendix slightly be denoting all non native species with an asterisk. I think this will help the readers not familiar with the flora. L178-182. I have added ecological text to the area of line 245 so I keep consistent with the format of other articles in the journal. L 193, Yes, this is a heading, similar to the previous ones used they are following the format of the journal. CI format, with the explanation of the bootstrapping procedure, the confidence intervals need to be written out and not written as a +/- format. L 265, I have gone with non peer reviewed instead of secondary. There are many other



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

can represent part of the overstory over time, you can speak of potentially changing canopy composition because of the presence/absence of <i>P.amarense</i> L265 What is a secondry publication? Also, there are many other potential causes; not just shading.. To state this is overly presumptious.	causes, shading is often referred to as a primary cause. I have attempted to clear this up in the sentence. Spongberg, (a secondary reference) states shading as the cause of many invasive species impacts. I didnt mean to imply that I was stating it, just pointing out its commonly the culprit in the popular media.
--	--