



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.	
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract and objective need revision to make it more attractive for the readers.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Daniel Jaleta</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ethiopian Environment and Forest Research Institute, Ethiopia</i>