



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	This study is important for the biodiversity, especially for the flora conservation. But the main contribution of study is not clearly described. The study's findings and the contribution of the study should be described in the abstract. There are several comments that describe in the manuscript. if possible, please describe the table for Shannon's index and Simpson's dominance index of the species (by species types or species families)? What are the effective plant species?	This study is important for the biodiversity, especially for the flora conservation. But the main contribution of study is not clearly described. This was further clarified in the paper, especially in the paper's conclusion. The study's findings and the contribution of the study should be described in the abstract. We made several changes in the abstract. There are several comments that describe in the manuscript. We adjusted that. if possible, please describe the table for Shannon's index and Simpson's dominance index of the species (by species types or species families)? Unfortunately, this is not possible, because the ownership of these indexes only perpetuates calculations for entire biological communities. The calculation of family order calculations is not possible nor recommended by researchers in ecology. What are the effective plant species? is the estimated number of species as a function of the weight assigned to the function that determines the importance on the abundance of species ($q = 1, 2$ and 3). As the value of "q" is increased, we increase the value corresponding to the value on the number of estimated species (qD). The value of "q" depends on the ecological process investigated and also on the interest in investigating common or rare species, or if there is simply no difference between them "q" will be $= 0$. This study findings is important for biodiversity, especially for flora conservation. So, what is the main contribution of this study, and to whom is mainly pointed for How do this study findings support and provide the biodiversity conservation? Floristic and phytosociological papers represent one of the most widespread uses and compilations of plant names by generalist botanists and data from these papers can be integrated in studies with a biogeographical approach. Moreover, floristic and phytosociological studies are a good source of ecological and biogeographical data not available from strictly taxonomic catalogues. Floristic studies often record information on plant habits, vegetation types and the geographical location of plant communities which can be integrated into biogeographical and macroecological studies. Once synthesized, these data can provide interesting insights about species, communities, and patterns, which could not be discerned from the individual studies [27].



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Some paragraphs in the discussion section are needed to check the sentence structure and revise the sentences. Some are not clear meaning what the author(s) want to describe and discuss.	We agreed and have already made the suggested changes. 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).