



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42016
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Different Levels of Inclusion for Forest Restoration Assessment
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	Who were the experts you tapped the species identification from? What about the key secondary literature you consulted? Kindly make us know for reliability of information	Considering that the seedlings were produced by the SUAPE Industrial Port Complex itself (the institution responsible for the production of the seedlings and for the reforestation of the area), most of it were known by those responsible for the production, that includes biologists, agronomists and agricultural technicians. The literature used to help with the identification it were mainly: LORENZI, H. Árvores brasileiras: Manual de Identificação e Cultivo de Plantas Arbóreas Nativas do Brasil. Vol. 1. Nova Odessa, Ed. Plantarum, 1992. 384p.; LORENZI, H. Árvores brasileiras: Manual de Identificação e Cultivo de Plantas Arbóreas Nativas do Brasil. Vol. 2. Nova Odessa, Ed. Plantarum, 1998. 352p.; LORENZI, H. Árvores brasileiras: Manual de Identificação e Cultivo de Plantas Arbóreas Nativas do Brasil. Vol. 3. Nova Odessa, Ed. Plantarum, 2009. 384p.; LORENZI, H. Árvores exóticas no Brasil. Nova Odessa, Inst. Plantarum, 2003. 368p.
Minor REVISION comments	Please, provide enough justification for this assertion made at the concluding part of the paper: 'it should be noted that this recommendation should not be applied for comparisons with reference ecosystems.'	We meant that it was not supposed to compare restoration areas using cbh $\geq$ 6 cm with reference ecosystems using cbh $\geq$ 15, but it's already implicit, so to avoid doubting interpretation, we have chosen to exclude this comment, which does not add up to the conclusions of our research.
Optional/General comments	This excellent paper assesses and monitors the processes for forest restoration to aid in finding out whether the proposed goals and objectives for recovering biodiversity as well as maintaining forest sustainability are satisfactorily achieved. The study is very relevant because forest restoration monitoring and assessment aids in arresting any potential unforeseen occurrences that could mar the forest restoration process so that immediate corrective measures could be undertaken. The paper is academically rigorous, interesting, and of novelty. The methodology is robust and replicable, while the discussions are orderly and comprehensively presented. The conclusions drawn from the findings are valid with sound recommendations. The paper makes a major contribution to the monitoring and assessment modules and/or approaches to forest restoration in the field of experimental agriculture and deserves to be published in this journal.	