



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_41335
Title of the Manuscript:	Tannic Potential of Bark from Forest Species from South Piauí
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	Line 1-2: The title does not reflect all that was done in the study. Kindly mention the specific species that was analysed in the title and you can also mention that the tannic extract properties were also analysed in the study. Re-write the title to a more comprehensive one. Line 52 - A local bushman cannot be used as credible source for identification of indigenous plants, kindly identify a botanist in your university or research institute to help with the identification or if you are sure of the plant, please removes the phrase as it lowers the credibility of your work. Line 61-You initially mentioned working with two species in the objective, but here you have mention five??? Line 65-66: Please mention briefly the techniques used in the cited articles and explain how the tannin potential was determined using the above methods Line 78 : Kindly remove 'obtainment' as it does not sound scientific and re-write the topic to Preparation of bovine skin powder Line 93 - Write the duration of the air drying and was there any initial sample preparation that was done? Line 94 - Write the duration of the air drying and was there any initial sample preparation that was done? Line 142 - Again mention the drying duration	Line 1-2: The title of the text was altered, aiming to cover the whole context, according to what was suggested by the magazine. Line 52 - The phrase was removed from the text, because we are sure of the species used in the research. Line 61 - In the methodology it is described that initially five species were chosen and from a pilot test were selected two species that presented higher content of reactive polyphenols, being this the criterion of selection Line 65-66: The techniques form inserted in the text, contributing with the understanding of the selection of the studied species. Line 78: The word has been changed, according to the magazine's subject matter. Line 93; 94; 142: The drying time has been entered in the text. The duration was 336 hours.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 15-Choose one between 'income generation' and economic feedback' because the meaning is almost the same Line 17-Combine the two words to read 'watercourses' Line 20-write 'of' in place of 'in' Line 22- Write 'have been produced' instead of 'are being produced' Line 25-Write 'an alternative way to add value' instead Line 27-28- Kindly re-write the statement as it is not clear Line 34-35-Is it a 'problem or problematic? rephrase the statement as it is not clear Line 41- kindly remove 'Kindly remove 'before this'	Line 15; 17; 20; 22; 25; 27-28; 34-35; 41: They were modified according to the suggestion of the magazine, improving the meaning of the text.
Optional/General comments	The work is generally good and publishable after the revisions are done	