



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_30953
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Environmental factors on the frequency and density of three functional groups of woody species in Ghana
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	The current manuscript described Effect of Environmental factors on the frequency and density of three functional groups of woody species in Ghana. The results showed that non-pioneer light demanding tree species have wider environmental range and higher frequency than pioneer and shade tolerant species which would be helpful for the management of tropical forests Vice-verse its conservation with special focus on the role of environmental factors. But the manuscript need some improvement in terms of writing and organization. In the abstract section, the author did not describe methods used in carrying out the quantitative measurement of frequency and density (as weather they were measured or estimated. The author equally cited a reference in the abstract which is strange. The author did not equally state the sample size and number of samples taken and if possible, weather soil samples were taken. The author did not also state the statistical package used in getting the percentage of the species tested. The environmental factors measured and methods used were not equally captured. Although the results were concluded well. Author should recast the abstract to suit the novel title. In the introduction section, the authors should introduce relative researches and emphasis the necessity of their work.	We appreciated the reviewers' for the insightful and constructive comments. The comments were relevant and important to improve our manuscript. Hence, we provided responses accordingly. Response 1.The comments are useful and constructive, and corrected accordingly. We now incorporate all comments and presented in the abstract part. Please see page 1 in the abstract section.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The Materials and Methods section is not clear enough, to make sure the current study can be reproducible. For example, the methods for heavy metal determinations should be described in detail (or cite references), since it is the critical experiment for the study. The methods for statistical analysis should be clarified. The Results section. The descriptions for table 1 and 2 are not necessary, since the readers could get the information from the tables. For the correction analysis between soil and plants, the author was suggested to apply comprehensive statistical tools such as good multivariate analysis. A lot of figures are partially invisible and the units should be labeled in the figures or indicated in the legends appropriately.	Response 2. The comments are accepted and corrected accordingly. We included and presented different scholar results and added detail information to stress the necessity of the work. Please see the introduction part. Thank you for this comment. We put cite for heavy metal determination and we clearly described the statistical analysis. Please see page the method section. The comments are accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see page in the revised manuscript. The comments are accepted and corrected accordingly. Please see all the corrected figures.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		