SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
However, as I had gone through the revised manuscript, I found some minor changes necessary before the manuscript could be accepted for publication. Please see the annotated manuscript appended herewith. . 1. Mention here the literature used for identification. 2. State how this was done??? 3. Why was non-parametric method used? Was the data tested for homogenity? Any transformation of data tried for normalization prior to adopting non-parametric method? Explain these here. 4. Mention here the version. 5. Is this the total of the two sites?? 6. Columns and rows are part of a table. 7. This should be moved to the results section.	1. The text was revised and the bibliography used was added: 10. Lorenzi H. Manual of Identification and Control of Weeds. 7ª ed. São Paulo: Institute Plantarum; 2014. 2. When it was not possible to identify the seeds in the previous procedures, the seeds were sown in trays containing vermiculite, in a greenhouse. After the immersion of the seedlings, they were identified from visual observation and consulted specialized bibliographies. 3. The number of seeds of tree-shrub species found in seed rain under artificial perches and areas controls and the density of tree species of natural regeneration under different treatments were subjected to the normality test of Shapiro-Wilk (1965) to verify if the data presented normal distribution, and were lateranalyzed using the non-parametric statistic, Kruskal-Wallis test (P=0.05), using the Assistat software 7.7. 4. The version is Assistat Software Version 7.7. 5. The total of 13,863 dispersed seeds were found in the two areas. The information was added in the text. 6. The text has been revised and modified. 7. The text has moved to the results section.