



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_44114
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics of carbon and nutrients in a successional forest sequence in the Mesopotamian Espinal (Argentina)
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	1. Introduction: Lines 33-57 is not introduction but materials and methods. Lines 39-42: the citation is missing. Lines 50-57: is plagiarism – needs to be changed. Lines 77-80: the explanation of the humina fraction is missing, it is the main one when we speak of carbon stocks in chronosequences. Lines 69-80: "on the other hand" appears three times, change expressions. 2. M&M: This item needs to be heavily altered. It is necessary to include a map of the location of the study area and the location of the experimental areas. The description of the laboratory analyzes is poor and without contextualization, needs to be enriched with details. 3. Results: - In the titles of the tables: description of successional stages and statistical analysis must be taken and included in the caption or observation. - Bulk density is not in M & M and should be included. - Is missing the table of nutrient concentrations of horizon A, why it is not in the paper? If there is any explanation, it should appear in M & M, because in M&M is saying that these analyzes were also carried out for horizon A. 4. Discussion: - The discussion needs to be radically improved, it does not discuss the findings of the paper, but rather presents a literature review. - Line 205: only statistical analysis does not prove that there is or is not spatial heterogeneity, only other types of analysis. - Lines 224-233: Why the humina data was not presented, if it is in the M & M? It's the main thing, it needs to be here in the discussion. 5. Conclusions: Should be related to what was found in the study. 6. References: If the paper has DOI, it should be included in the reference.	1. Introduction: OK Paragraph was write for the main author of the present wordk (Mendoza, C) for which it would not be considered as plagiarism. Anyway paragraph has been changed. OK OK 2. M&M This map was included in a previous publication. Laboratory analysis carried out according to usually standard procedures and we think that did not require specific descriptions. 3. Results I don't understand OK Corrections were made in M&M 4. Discussion Data was discussed in relation with previous available publications. OK M&M only included both humic and fulvic acids. 5. Conclusions I don't understand reviewer's suggestion 6. References OK
Minor REVISION comments	Review the journal's publication standards after rewriting the paper.	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	It has been noted.