



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	General comment: The major issue in the manuscript is the difficulty in understanding the English in some of the sections – particularly the Abstract and Introduction. Comment 1: Abstract: Too long and chatty. Information such as the land ownership belongs in the Methods Comment 2: Introduction: Difficult to understand at times. Please check the writing. Comment 3: Methods: How did you measure % needles in the litter for Fig. 7? Comment 4: Results: How does Fig. 3 suggest that orchids disappear in mixed forest – that is indeed the case but the figure does not suggest that. Fig. 4 – please include the area for abundances in the caption. Humus and litter layer – much of this material belongs in the Discussion. Please shorten and streamline the Results so that what the results actually are can be easily determined. Put the other stuff in the Discussion! Line 259 – well, the needles stay on a tree for many years. Also, more difficult to decompose by decomposers.	General Response: We appreciated the reviewers' comments and found them useful. We have tried to make the paper more readable and informative. we improved the language, readability and the structure of the manuscript in all chapters. Please see the revised manuscript. Response 1: Abstract: This comment is accepted corrected accordingly. Please see page 1, line 3-23, in the revised manuscript. Response 2: Introduction: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. Pleases see the introduction, page 1-3, line 25-77, in the revised manuscript. Response 3: Method: thank you for this comment. We took needle % by direct observation. Response 4: Results: Thanks for these comments. In fig 3, we showed the distribution of plant community across different forest type. I accept your comment and deleted the suggestion paragraph. Please see page 8, line 195, in the revised manuscript. - in figure 4 we showed abundance class of orchids species under different forest type, and the abundance class is indicated under the fig.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Comment 5: Discussion: Line 287-295. OK! Line 300. Please tell the reader to look at Figs. 4 & 6. This is also the case elsewhere in the Discussion – it is good to know where to go see the supporting data.	Hence, we found that including the area does not any to the result, since the size of each plot were described under the method section. please see the revised manuscript. - we shorted the Humus and litter layer, subsection, by avoiding further discussion within the result. Please see page 10-11, line 232-260. Response 5: Discussion: These comments are accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page 12, line 279 in the revised manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Comment 6: Be sure not to start a sentence with an abbreviation. End sentences with the figure and number in parentheses. Example: Sentence... (Fig. X). Line 328-329, 336-334. Yes, the importance of orchid mycorrhizae may be significant. “In general more different mycorrhiza will occur in coniferous forests [39] which make this hypothesis more plausible” – I am not sure if you can generalize from these results.	Response 6: This comment is accepted and corrected accordingly. We have checked the beginning off the sentence and use of parentheses after figures, in the entire documents. - Here we tried to discuss the importance of mycorrhiza for orchids based of available literatures. Indeed we cannot generalize based on our results, and also we indicated that in our discussion. Please see page 13, line 313-317, in the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Comment 7: A scientifically thorough research project. Nicely done. Your conclusions are solid due to the diversity of data that was collected.	Response 1: Thank you for this comment