



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48674
Title of the Manuscript:	Floristic composition in chronosequence in Atlantic Rainforest fragments
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>)

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 needs to follow this guide; introduction, main objective of the study, methods used in the research, results and recommendation if any. (All these in summary form so that it should not be more than 400 words) Adjust introduction to 4 or 5 paragraphs Methods are too scanty and not clear. Authors need to state clearly the methods. Clearly state how your images were taken and their different resolutions and how the images help to differentiate the young from old forest. The classification of the images. Also tell us in method how interviews help in the research and the type of interview used Clearly state the botanical survey methods, how the plots were laid, tools and materials used. How identification of species was done. Did you measure the circumference of the tree species (dbh)? You have to state it here. If you used any field guide or text book to help in the identification of plants, state it here	Modified Done All modified
Minor REVISION comments	In the species list provided within the five fragments, let the Families have a different column from the species. It makes the work good and well organised. Authors should also make use of current literature The authors should read the work again to correct minor language problems especially punctuations	
Optional/General comments	I prefer results to be separated from Discussion. If this is possible the authors should separate the work to suit this style. It is very scientific. When you mix results with discussion, the fruit of the research is hardly realised. First present your results and discuss them later in respect to other researchers	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	