



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31498
Title of the Manuscript:	Population structure and Regeneration of Croton scabiosus Bedd. (Euphorbiaceae) in dry forests of Southern Eastern Ghats of YSR Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh, India
Type of the 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	ABSTRACT 1. Start abstract with problem statement (what led to this study?) 2. Abstract: No information on population structure or regeneration is given, which is the core theme of this paper – please include 3. Abstract: Line 11/12 (last sentence of abstract) Threat analysis not done – and is not part of this study – suggest removal INTRODUCTION 4. Lack information on why population structure studies and regeneration studies are so important in dry deciduous and scrub forests, respectively. 5. Lines 21-26 (references 3 and 4) , pertain to threats – this is not relevant to this study, no connect to results – suggest removal 6. Line 29/30 habitat loss and degradation is not part of this study's objective – and thus not relevant to this study – suggest removal. 7. Line 33-35 – no need to list descriptions of <i>C. scabiosus</i> by authors in other areas – not relevant to this study – suggest removal. 8. Line 39/40 – no need to list vernacular names – not relevant to this type of study. Suggest removal. 9. Include heading : MATERIALS AND METHODS above Study area heading 10. Study area: Line 58: “ The study was carried out at each location to assess the density...” No density data is presented. Suggest rephrasing of sentence, or include density data. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 11. First present OVERALL data (ALL forests). Then contrast the dry deciduous vs scrub forests. This research was done in 2 different ecosystems. Thus it would be presumptuous to just present overall data. 12. P3, lines 78-82: Duplication of representation of data: first in	Problem statement given. Given Removed Given Deleted Deleted Deleted Deleted Included Rephrased Results and Discussion separated. Numerical format deleted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	numerical format, then in percentage. Suggest present on data in percentage format only. 13. Associated tree species are presented in on p5 in both text and table format – this is unnecessary and duplication – suggest removal of the one or the other. 14. Discussion part is basically non-existent: The data is not placed in the wider body of knowledge via referenced statements. Most discussion statements are speculative in nature – and therefore carries limited to no authority. 15. The inclusion of associated species is never discussed in terms of their influence on the population structure or regeneration of <i>C. scabiosus</i>. Thus it is unsure as to their value in this paper – this needs a serious relook!! CONCLUSION 16. Line 143 – Reference 6 – no references to be included in abstract – it's about <u>your</u> insight only. 17. Line 144-147 – this is a repetition of the methodology – suggest removal. 18. Line 147-151– this is a repetition of the results – suggest removal. 19. Line 156-158 – no anthropogenic threat analysis has been done as part of this study – suggest removal.	Associated tree species in text format removed, table format retained Discussion part separated. Discussed Reference in conclusion deleted Removed Removed Removed
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	ABSTRACT 1. Check Southern Eastern Ghats vs South Eastern Ghats. (also on line 38 (Introduction)) 2. Change eleven (line 6) to 11 3. Line 13: Change Words to Keywords INTRODUCTION 4. Line 15: "In India, the dry..." 5. Line 16: "...generate a variety of natural resources, <u>but</u> also..." 6. Line 38: "... It is listed as vulnerable..." 7. Line 40: "This plant species..." 8. Line 41: "...seeds are seed <u>as an</u> antidote for..." <i>Just too many grammar issues in this paper to mention. The paper should be proofread by a proficient scientific English editor before a resubmission.</i> DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 9. Line 68 (..and inventoried all tree which are associated...) and Line 75/76 ("... In each study site...) are duplications – suggest remove line 76. 10. What are the height class and diameter class definitions/demarcations? How was this measured? RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 11. Line 95/95: (... Out of the 11 forest areas studies <i>more population of Croton</i>...) – very bad grammar 12. Eventhough (Line 98) vs even though (line 100) – inconsistency 13. Line 127: place period (fullstop) at end of sentence 14. P7: Figures have no legends?? CONCLUSION Line 143	Agreed - changed to South, even in title also changed Changed to 11 Changed to Keywords Changed sentence Changed Changed Deleted Changed Removed Details given Rewritten Modified Modified Legends given
Optional/General comments	1. What about the influence of the understorey vegetation (or even canopy cover) on regeneration/recruitment – see discussion section? 2. Fig. 1: Would have preferred 2 photos of dry deciduous forests and 2 photos of scrub forests. This for a better contrast.	Discussed Photos changed