

Editor's comment:

- 1) The manuscript seems to poor as well as the Introduction.
- 2) In the first paragraph of page two, there are several references which are clearly unjustified - for example Refs 23-26 and 27-30. The assumption does not deserve so much empty references. Instead, authors should discuss the content of such articles (clonal variations/site effects)
- 3) The results and discussion should be improved (four small paragraphs), probably using the references therein.
- 4) There are several inconsistencies in the References - Ref 30 has a English title and the whole article is written in English (not in Portuguese). Also, the name of the first author is not correctly addressed.
- 5) The text needs proof reading by a native-speaker - several grammatical and typing errors are observed.
- 6) A small remark! Why not Sabiá wood, instead Sabiá wood specie?

Author's feedback:

- 1) We agree with this comment, but, introduction showed the importance of the characterization of the wood properties, mainly of new species with possibility of use in the civil construction, in this case the wood of Sabiá.
- 2) We agree with this comment.
- 3) It does not exist in the researched literature, until now, researches on the physical and mechanical properties of Sabiá wood. Therefore, the properties values determined for Sabiá wood were compared with values presented by the wood of other Brazilian native species. The values found for Sabiá wood are consistent and indicate its use in construction.
- 4) We agree with this comment.
- 5) Ok, it has been reviewed.
- 6) Ok, it has been reviewed.