



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_43639
Title of the Manuscript:	AGROBIODIVERSITY OF HOMEGARDENS IN MARANHÃO, 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	1. Grammar is exceedingly poor, and the paper should be professionally proofread before a next submission. There are just too many to indicate in this report. 2. See journal guidelines regarding short communications and the number of tables and figures allowed. 3. Abstract a. Start with problem sentence b. Explain the Spanish term: "mantenedors" 4. Introduction a. Paragraph 2, Line 20: "A reservoir of agrobiodiversity in rural or urban communities is the domestic homegardens [3,4],..."why is there a need to cite 2 references when 1 would suffice? See also line 31 of paragraph 3 of introduction b. Paragraph 2, Line 22: "According to [6], the homegardens comprise..." Cannot reference like this! Suggest the following: "According to Pikar [6], homegardens comprise..." Correct this mistake throughout the paper. c. Paragraph 2, Line 28. Correct the citation format as indicated above. d. Paragraph 2, Line 26: "...variation, so	The grammar was verified as solicited Many errors were found that compromised the content of the text, so the proposed considerations were very important for the improvement of the text. The abstract was totality revised. The term "mantenedors" is an typing error In introduction all recommendations were accepted The suggestions were accepted because they were all relevant to improving the content of the text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	conservation of resources, using this <u>procedure</u>" – to what procedure are you referring to here? e. Indicate how your study differs from [13, 14, 15]. Otherwise it would like a duplication of those investigations. 5. Materials and Methods a. Paragraph 1, Line 48: "...households consisting of <u>houses, houses or similar...</u>"- unclear statement. b. Paragraph 2: Indicate how many were houses, and how many were residential units? c. Paragraph 2: Indicate themes of questionnaire, not direct questions. d. How were answers analysed? Via descriptive statistics? e. What about the ethical issues? How were they addressed? Consent obtained? f. Figure 1 Google map sub-figure (showing residential units) too small to be of value? Also it does not indicate the units sampled. 6. Results and Discussion a. Use themes of questionnaire as subheadings. This would make orientation and understanding better. b. "With two or more plant species for homegarden, only a botanical variety was found in three homegardens." - unclear – rephrase c. The representativeness of these families is closely related to the various resources that their representatives <u>propose them</u>" - - unclear – rephrase d. Paragraph 1: Discussion needed of results	All material and Methods was revised according to the recommendation. All recommendations of Results were accepted and modified
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	e. Paragraph 2: Discussion needed of results f. Table 1: "List of inventoried plant species in homegardens agroforestry. Constant in the table: family, scientific name, popular name and form of use." Legend should read: "Inventoried plant species in homegardens agroforestry." g. Table 1: Indicate language of popular names (Spanish?)" h. Figure 2: "Number of species per botanical family found in agroforestry homegardens in Maranhão, Brazil." Legend should read: "Plant species per family in agroforestry homegardens in Maranhão, Brazil" i. Paragraph 3, Lines 93-96: Cannot have a 1 sentence paragraph. Breakup into 2-3 more manageable sentences. j. Paragraph 4, Lines 97-103: Discussion needed of results k. Paragraph 5, lines 104-107: Cannot have a 1 sentence paragraph. Breakup into 2-3 more manageable sentences. l. Figure 3 is unnecessary as the information can be adequately captured in text format – suggest removing it." m. Lines 122-123: "For [21], fruit species provide food sources to growers and places of refuge, shelter and food for animals, especially birds [22]." Does this information come from 21 or from 22 – they cannot both be in the same sentence. n. Lines 126-138: Discussion needed of results o. Line 139-141: Discussion via reference [27] is not linked to any results of this study. Suggest removing it or relocating it. p. Line 142-143: "In the researched yards, the	It's necessary a conclusion, journal puts this into the norms
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	management of the plants is handmade and carried out by nature, that is, there is no specific care with the plants.” – Unclear – suggest rephrasing sentence q. Line 147: Why cite reference [25] when reporting your own results? 7. Conclusion a. Short communication paper normally does not have a conclusion section. Suggest removing it and incorporating it in Abstract. 8. Reference list a. References 24, 25 and 27 not listed? b. Many inconsistencies in format and punctuation. c. Not always in accordance with journal guidelines.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? Yes. The study used the intellectual property of respondents when questioning them. This paper <u>did NOT indicate</u> how the ethical issues surrounding this study was resolved.	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> A document was not used in the ethics committee because the work was done with the total authorization of the residents, so it was not an invasive work.
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	