



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	Line 31: "pressures" should be "impact" and "typically" should be "typical" Line 33: "...process of degradation..." should be and continue "...degradation process of..." Line 34-35: "Soil degradation is one of the most important factors in establishing desertification" Before or after this sentence, there should be another sentence to support the statement. If not, this sentence look alone and not enough for giving the impact of the idea and there should be a reference. Line 37: instead of "tools" word, "applications" can be used. Line 45-46: the sentence continuing "...decomposition, processes of great importance in the restoration of soil fertility,..." can be written like "...processes of soil fertility restoration which has a great importance,..." Line 46: this part of the sentence "mainly in areas beginning of ecological succession." Can be re-written. It is not clear. Line 49: "on the present day" should be "nowadays" or "at the present time" Line 70: according to the material & method part, there are 10 places to be got the study samples. But there is lack of information. What is the size of the each area? According to the summary, burlap was collected from the 1m² area and it is clear that there are 10 sampling points and three different place but, in general, is there a study place which is a polygon and contains sample points? There should be more information about the study area and it is needed to put more figures or pictures about it. Should be explained more. Line 88: I think "caatinga" is a place name and should start with capital letter. Line 90: "The collected Burlap was during the period from September 2015 to July 2016." This sentence is not clear and stays alone in the paragraph. Line 96: what is the material? Explanations are not clear, when researchers read the paper they of course will understand what does "it" mean but at the same time they want to see detailed explanations in the paper. For example, if the paper is about splash erosion and if you study with the soil sample or sand you have to write sand or soil samples or soil particles, it is not appropriate to write just "material" unfortunately. Line 105-110-118: Formulas should have number in order and be stated in the paragraphs. Line 127 (results): Results cannot be written in this way. There are no tables and figures. If there are plenty of numbers and tables in the of course it would be appropriate tp put them at the end but not in this paper. Explanations should be at the bottom of the tables and figures as in all international scientific papers. Line 130: There are abbreviations like CEMD, CEAD or etc.. There should be explanation of what do they mean in the first usage place not at the end. Line 163: What does "caatinga stages"? Line 171: Instead of "leaf fall", "fall of leaf or "fall leaf" should be used. Line 280: Are the pins show the study places? Where are the sampling points of 10? Pins show three different places where the sampling was done but is it polygon? It is clear that burlap was collected from 1m2 and in two stage, five areas were selected for the study but it is not clear to understand where are the sampling points on the map. There should be more pictures or figures in this paper, not enough.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I would like to thank the authors for their efforts in this valuable paper. But, there are some sentences which cannot explain the main idea of what should be given in the paper and the paper is lack of figures. Material and method part can be revised. According to the tables and figures, comments should be re-written at the bottom of them.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Melis Özge Pinar
Department, University & Country	Department of Climate Change & Agricultural Ecology, Transitional Zone Agricultural Research Institute of MoFAL, Turkey