



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38652
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Fertility as a Predictor of the Geospatial Distribution of Forest Species in Natural Regeneration in Brazil
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>)

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 paper is very well written and the topic is important as far as the restoration of degraded areas of Atlantic Forest, Brazil is concerned.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At P3, L 79-82 where methodology for soil chemical attributes is mentioned....I would like to say that at least 3 samples should have been taken to form a composite sample <i>i.e.</i> 0-10 cm, 11-20 cm and 21-30 cm. That would have been much better, take care of this for future investigations. At P5, L12-122 where it is mentioned that "Besides, nutrient concentrations were higher on the soil's surface." It should be written as "nutrient concentrations are higher on the soil's surface." Because is an established fact. In Table 1, at P6..... I think the 7th tree species, <i>Caraipa densifolia</i> Mart. belongs to family "Calophyllaceae" and not to "Annonaceae"....please confirm/check? In Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 the different average values must be followed by standard deviations. This will validate the results obtained. Authors can easily calculate them. Conclusion is a repetition of discussion. It needs to be ELABORATED. 	<p>The composite sample was composed of four simple samples. The depth of the collection was only two (0-10 cm) and (11-20 cm)</p> <p>Ok. We correct</p> <p>Ok. We correct</p> <p>Ok. We correct</p> <p>Ok. We correct</p>
Optional/General comments	THE REST IS OK.	