



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38968
Title of the Manuscript:	Burlap and breakdown of waste plant in desertification processes semiarid of the states of Alagoas
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	For me, the manuscript “Burlap and breakdown of waste plant in desertification processes semiarid of the states of Alagoas” Is presented as a short communication form: this article did not have a solid and defensible discussion section. • Very short introduction. The authors can enrich the introduction by new references, • The authors must justify why they chose the selected method to achieve the objective; • Several statements are not supported by references • What is the new in the used methodology? • Add Caption to table 1, the reader should get a first impression of the relevance of a contribution only by studying the illustration, and without reading the paper sections to understand the meanings of the used abbreviations: CV, CEAD, CEMD, CEBD, b B, a B, a D ... ?? The table 1 has to be self understandable. • Please check the manuscript carefully for the correction of punctuation, some unclear sentences. • Implications of the Manuscript are missing. • The results, the discussion, and the conclusion sections are too short; • Missing limitations and perspectives For these reasons, I recommend major revision	Thank you for your comments and suggestions. Some questions were corrected and unfortunately others will not be possible because there is little information about the biome under study the poor discussion. However with this possible publication and with the continuity and stimulation of the studies in the region and in the biome quoted I believe that in little we will have more discussions.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		