



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_43639
Title of the Manuscript:	AGROBIODIVERSITY OF HOMEGARDENS IN MARANHÃO, BRAZIL
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors have made considerable improvements with respect to the first version of this manuscript. However, the manuscript needs additional revisions as part of the materials and methods, and to improve the clarity and readability of the manuscript. In some cases, the authors overlooked some suggestions to improve the manuscript, as well as some of the editorial comments made on the first version to address some grammatical issues. The authors also need to double-check and revise each of the citations provided, as I noted some mistakes that were also highlighted as part of the first version of this manuscript. Below are some suggestions that I made as part of the first version of the manuscript, for consideration by the authors. This information would provide additional context, clarity, and understanding for future readers of this article, • Please provide a brief description of the climate, rainfall per year, temperature range, and description of the rainy and dry	We apologize for having missed some remarks from your mr. Broker. A brief description of the temperature and climate of the region of the study area was made as requested by the broker. The homegardens consist of plots, these being arranged at a distance from the house and not around.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

seasons. • Please provide a general description, inc. size of home-gardens? Did gardens consist of individual plots, or were plants distributed around the house. Were all gardens established within the house, or were there some community gardens, at some distance from the household? • The authors may want to include a hypothesis as part of the introduction section, such as, "our hypothesis was that these community gardens contribute to agrobiodiversity, food security, and to the inter-generational sharing of culture and practical gardening information". • Are the gardens in production year-round or part of the year? • Do they have beds or plots to grow vegetables, or are plants only grown in several areas around the house? • Need to better describe the average number of species found per home-garden, eg each garden on average was growing 12 plant species. [Note, please also list the range of no. of species found on all gardens, eg 2-15, i.e. the garden with the lowest number of species only had 2 species on the garden, and the garden with the most no. of species had 15 species on their garden] • Need to better describe the frequency with which the species were found in all of the gardens. Perhaps can include this information as an additional column in Table 1 (or placed in parentheses as part of the 3rd column), and also as part of Figure 3 (describing the number of gardens where each food group was found in the individual gardens., e.g., fruit trees were found in 16 gardens). Additional comments on the current 2nd version of the manuscript include, L 12-17, please look at editorial suggestions made for first version of this manuscript. The authors appear to have	The article raises the hypothesis that gardens contribute to the diversity of botanical families and to the use of methods that guarantee food security and subsistence conditions. Production takes place every year It was made a better description of homegarden species at home, also adding the habit of growing all botanical species. As mentioned in the previous comment, one more column was added in the table, where the growth habit of each botanical species is organized. We apologize for letting you pass any of your suggestions mr. Broker. Suggestions for the first version were reviewed
--	--



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

overlooked my suggestions. The first sentence, as it stands, is grammatically incorrect. L 66-72. Please look at editorial suggestions made for the first version of this manuscript. L 79, The text indicates 47 species, but Table 1 lists only 45 species. Need to reconcile. L 80-81 & 130-133, Need to clarify this sentence, which states that "only a botanical variety was found in three homegardens." This appears to be contradicted in lines 130-133, which indicates that several species are grown on multiple gardens, e.g "among them <i>Malpighia glabra</i> (acerola) 12 individuals present in 11 homegardens." Please also indicate the range of number of plant species, as well as the average number of plant species found on all home-gardens. E.g. "The range of number of plant species found per garden was 2-18, and the average number was 8." L 104-105, and Fig. 3, Some species have dual use as spices/herbs, and for food (vegetables). On my count, 11 of the species listed on Table 1 may be used as vegetables (as root crops & leafy crops), which would represent about 24%, of the 45 species listed on Table 1. May want to incorporate this information on Figure 3, perhaps with a composite section for herbs/vegetables. However, it may be helpful to include in the text that root crops (and vegetables?) are also an important component of the home-gardens. L 141-142, Please see my suggestions from a review of the first manuscript. In that version I suggested the text "1 to 5x the minimum wage"? (list minimum wage here, in USA Dollars, per day or per month, e.g. \$3 USD per day), along	The mistake was ours, there are 45 species in fact. Typing error This piece of text has been revised on request. In the form that has been revised, we believe that it is possible to interpret the data as requested. We agreed with the broker that the data was indeed incoherent, and we rephrase the fragments that contained the contradictions. We are taking into account the minimum wage in Brazil, which corresponds to R \$ 954.00 or equivalent to USD 228.58. The sentences have been corrected The grammar was revised as requested
--	--



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

with another suggestion made at the bottom of the sentence—to improve the grammatical structure of the sentence. L 144-143, I made suggestions to improve the grammar of this sentence, as indicated in the first version of this manuscript. L 148-150, Please look at the editorial suggestions made on the first version of this manuscript, to improve the grammar on this sentence. L 153-155, The authors failed to re-phrase this paragraph, as suggested in the first version of this manuscript. An alternative wording is suggested here. L 189-191, The authors need to double check and review all the citations. The proper citation for Reference No. 7 would be, “Rosa LS, Silveira EL, Santos MM, Modesto RS, Perote JRS, Vieira TA. Os quintais agroflorestais em áreas de agricultores familiares no município de Bragança-PA: composição florística, uso de espécies e divisão de trabalho familiar. Rev. Bras de Agroecologia 2007 2(2), 337-341” L 212-213, The authors failed to correct this citation, as suggested on the first version of this manuscript. Is “Economic Boatani” a Journal? L 214-216, Need proper citation, author (Anonymous?) and title. The WEB link provided for this citation does not work. L 217-219, proper citation for this reference would be (note that it has a revised publication date of 2017): Ministério da Agricultura. Estudo Indica Áreas para o Plantio de Sete Culturas. 2017. Governo do Brasil, Economia e Emprego. Accessed Aug. 2, 2018 from,	The suggestion was fully accepted. All references have been reviewed There was some translation error, but it was corrected. The author has been added. As this is a 2016 work, some things have been updated This reference has been corrected
---	---



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<http://www.brasil.gov.br/economia-e-emprego/2011/12/estudo-indica-areas-para-o-plantio-de-sete-culturas>

Additional editorial suggestions are included in the attached pdf copy of the manuscript.

End of comments.

////