



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42854
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity and structure of adult and regenerating forest component in inselberg 'Alto-Montana', Paraíba-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>)



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	Abstract: Line 8: the abstract need revision by including short introduction sentences, methods and conclusion. Separate the objective in two or three/ or summarize it in to one clear target 1. study the diversity and similarity profiles of vegetal species from adult and regenerating arboreal component in "Alto-Montana" inselberg forest area, 2. evaluating and modulating the effective numbers of vegetal species on the different strata. Introduction Line 14-20: the citation should start from 1 but not from 11 and 34 The paragraph is not completed. The first paragraph need sentence that shows us what should be done. Line 24: change heather to weather Line 21-27: the important of this paragraph is not clear so please modified in more targeted manner. Line 29: how the smaller area (2,626.68km²) included the bigger area (18,500km²). Please check this sentence. Line 31-39: there are few long sentences so please avoid those sentences. Line 44-47: it is long sentence so please avoid this sentence. Line 52-54: the objective is complicated and complex to understand. In addition is not exactly similar in message to what described in the abstract. Please summarize and re write clear objective that should be SMART. Data collection: It is not yet clear for me how did you arrange those plots in the study area as indicated on map. Plot arrangement is said to be distributed randomly however on map it looks systematically arrangement. Please be clear on this matter? Line 155-160: these sentences are not part of your study so why you have mentioned them here. Please describe the significance of these sentences here? Line 188: what does it mean "data not shown"? Line 218-222: how did you compare with smaller sample size? Line 227-230: it is general knowledge description. But the section is result section. Please insert it in discussion section. Line 246-247: please provide us the reason behind the floristic overlap oth these area..... Line 264-265: " methodological sampling discrepancies and inclusion limits adopted" who did these? It is not clear for the readers. The previous or this study? Please re write this paragraph in more simple and understandable way. Line 290-294:if there is no significant difference for richness and floristic composition what is the need of discussing here? Please avoid such discussion? Reference: Please arrange the reference in order of citing starting from introduction to conclusion.	Okay, Okay, Okay, Okay Okay, Line 24: change heather to weather Okay, Line 21-27: the important of this paragraph is not clear so please modified in more targeted manner. We agreed and already made the changes. Okay Line 29: how the smaller area (2,626.68km²) included the bigger area (18,500km²). Please check this sentence. We agreed and already made the changes. Okay Line 31-39: there are few long sentences so please avoid those sentences. Okay, Line 44-47: it is long sentence so please avoid this sentence. Okay, Line 52-54: the objective is complicated and complex to understand. In addition is not exactly similar in message to what described in the abstract. Please summarize and re write clear objective that should be SMART. Okay It's all right. We have already made some changes and hopefully have made the objective and hypotheses more accessible. Okay Data collection: It is not yet clear for me how did you arrange those plots in the study area as indicated on map. We randomly sampled 22 plots of 10 x 20 m (200 m²), which totaled an area of 4400 m² (8.88% of the total area). We also excluded the outermost areas of the fragment in the sampling to avoid the "edge effect", approximately 25-50 m from the forest edge. This sentence was best described in the text. Okay Plot arrangement is said to be distributed randomly however on map it looks systematically arrangement. Please be clear on this matter? Yes. The plots are randomly distributed, however only the interior of the forest in order to avoid the "edge effect" in the evaluation of the study. Okay Line 155-160: these sentences are not part of your study so why you have mentioned them here. Please describe the significance of these sentences here? Although these species have not been sampled because they are in places not covered by the objectives of this study, we think that listing the presence of these species here may help other studies to consider them in biogeographic studies. In addition, we think these species may be neglected in conservation policies if we have not quoted here. Line 188: what does it mean "data not shown"? This is preliminary data mining charts that help in the discussion of the results. But we do not consider it necessary to introduce them.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Line 218-222: how did you compare with smaller sample size? Here we refer to the sample size found in the different strata, with 800 individuals for the adult stratum and 1508 for the regenerating stratum. From this we leveled the theoretical projections for 2000 individuals, in order to overcome the problem of natural sampling differences. The smallest sample size is always the reference sample, while the largest sample includes the reference sample and the theoretical sample projection of individuals in the community. Line 227-230: it is general knowledge description. But the section is result section. Please insert it in discussion section. This was altered in the text. Line 246-247: please provide us the reason behind the floristic overlap oth these area..... This was described in the text. Line 290-294:if there is no significant difference for richness and floristic composition what is the need of discussing here? Please avoid such discussion? By consensus in this paper, we understand that the most coherent metrics on diversity analysis are divided into several facets. Only the entropy of species richness and similarity did not show any differences, the others all showed consistent differences. That is why there is a need for discussion. Please arrange the reference in order of citing starting from introduction to conclusion. It's all right. We have already made the changes.
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract and objective need revision to make it more attractive for the readers.	We agreed and already made the changes.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has included valuable information for future studies in the Atlantic forest. The findings of this study will provide direction for decision makers for future planning and action in the sensitive forests. I appreciated the authors for presenting such findings in the manuscript. However revision should be made on the manuscript specially shortening sentences and paragraphs in order to make it more attractive for the readers.	additional changes: In addition, we made some specific changes in the article title. We replace the terms "in inselberg 'Alto-Montana'" with "forest 'submontana'", because we believe that the latter term better describes the geomorphology and the peculiarity of the study area. Based on the national classification of native forests in Brazil - Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE).

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>