



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_30488
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of forest succession on the occurrence of two orchid species on Terschelling the Netherlands
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	General comment: It is important to improve the English and review all the manuscript. Comment 1: Page 1, line 5: Is <i>Goodyera repens</i> do not <i>Goodyear repens</i> Comment 2: Page 4, lines 95-96: explain here why it was used 10X10 and 4X4 m releveés sizes Comment 3: Page 4, line 104: Now is ... " a classification (0=0, 1=1-10,... please indicate: classification according number of individuals (0=0, 1=1-10,... Comment 4:Page 5, line 123: "A 10X10 plot was placed in every plot" it is not clear, please explain. Comment 5:Page 8, delete line 184, it is not necessary Comment 6:Page 8, lines 197 and 198: delete " <i>N. cordata</i> does occur in this vegetation type, but does not make the same abundances at it does in the Vaccino Picetalia" because it is repetitive, since later on the results of the abundance are shown. Comment 7:Page 9, delete lines 201 and 202 Comment 8:Page 9, line 203, Mention the Ellenberg indicator values between the two plant communities, and delete "more or less".	General response: We appreciated the reviewers' comments and found them useful. We have tried to make the paper more readable and informative. Please see the responses given to specific comments for details. Response 1: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. please see page 1, line 3, in the revised manuscript. Response 2: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 4, line 85-86 in the revised manuscript. Response 3: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 4. Line 95-96in the revised manuscript. Response 4: Thank you very much for this comment. Now it is clear and understandable. Please see page 5, line 112, in the revised manuscript. Response 5: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 7, line 172, in the revised manuscript. Response 6: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 7, line 184, in the revised manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Comment 9:Page 9, line 204 explain why both plant communities are in the same abiotic circumstances Comment 10:Page 10, lines 213 and 215, To correct scientific name of <i>N. cordata</i>, it is not <i>N. cordatia</i> Comment 11:Page 10, line 221: correct " There is no significant difference in basal are per forest type..... please review writing, because it is not understandable Comment 12:Page 10, delete lines 228 and 229, because in methods was mentioned Comment 13:Page 13, delete lines 288-292 " This makes... " after write something like: It is important to take into consideration the environmental factors... Comment 14:Page 11, line 246: now is: <i>N. cordata</i>, change to <i>N. cordata</i> (write the scientific names in italics). Same observation in page 12, line 265; page 13, lines 297 and 298. Comment 15:In results section try do not discuss them, only show results, example in Pages 11 and 12, in lines 249 -279 about humus and litter layer you discuss some results, please don't do that. Comment 16:Page 14, lines 328 and 329 delete "Also the presence of specific mycorrhiza might be important for both orchids" because it is repetitive as after you make a discussion about this (lines 336 to 343). Comment 17:P. 16, line 376 write <i>P. nigra</i> not <i>P.nigra</i>.	Response 7: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see 8, line 186, in the revised manuscript. Response 8: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 8, line 187, in the revised manuscript. Response 9: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 8, line 188-190, in the revised manuscript. Response 10: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 8, line 197, in the revised manuscript. Response 11: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 8, line 205-206, in the revised manuscript. Response 12: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 9, line 210, in the revised manuscript. Response 13: Thank you for this comment. We re-write this part to make it very clear. Please see page 11, line 266-271, in the revised manuscript. Response 14: This comment is accepted and corrected in the entire manuscript. Response 15: Thank you for this comment. We corrected accordingly. please see the result sections, in the revised manuscript. Response 16: this comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Please page 13, line 306, in the revised manuscript. Response 17: This comment is accepted and corrected in the entire manuscript.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Comment 18: Review English throughout the manuscript Comment 19: Ethical issue: the authors did not destroyed orchids individuals	Response 18: Thank you for this comment. we corrected the English through the entire document. please see the revised document. Response 19: Thank you very much. We took the maximum care not to destroy any individual orchids.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		