



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_42483
Title of the Manuscript:	PAPILIONOIDEAE OF AN AREA OF VEGETATION IN NORTHEASTERN 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments Abstract: Material and Methods: 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:	Abstract is incomplete as per authors guideline. Need revision of abstract considering objective, methods, result of the study. - Line 54-55; Figure 1 should shift under line 46. - Line 56; Incomplete sentence; Were realized monthly excursions in the period from September 2016 to February 2017 - Line 57; language errors; In the field work 57 were collected the s...? - Check 12spp represents as 12spp. Revise all Scientific names accordingly. Refer suggestions: (When referring to a plant in a genus when we do not know which species it is, we use the generic name followed by 'sp.' ie: <i>Desmodium sp.</i> When referring collectively to some or all of the species in a genus we use the generic name followed by 'spp.' ie: <i>Desmodium spp.</i>) - Require Proper Taxonomic representation of Key 91-181 of Subfamily Papilionoideae to all from line 182-523.	The abstract was changed and standardized according to the guidelines of the journal, structured in only objective, methods and results as considered by the reviewer. The position of the figure has been changed as recommended. The data of collection methods was rewritten, being better clarified and elucidated for understanding and understanding of the reader. The grammatical error of line 57 was rewritten and corrected. Scientific names were revised and abbreviations of species (spp) were withdrawn, leaving the numerical data only in extenso, for better understanding and removing ambiguities. Keys and descriptions were revised where some terms were changed and rewritten some sentences to better clarify the metrics performed and the morphological structures described.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Proper formatting considering taxonomical order	All the suggested comments were made and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• More literature review • Clear objective and methodology of the study • Correction of scientific names • Language correction	greatly improve the technical quality of the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• If the study will elaborate all information from Introduction to Conclusion; It makes more clear of the study • Diagrammatic representation will make attractive of the manuscript	The whole text was improved and the conclusion became more objective leaving the text cleaner as requested.. No schematic representations were added in order to insert a table with several data schematically in an objective way on the results obtained with the research.