



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48720
Title of the Manuscript:	Litter in potential eucalypts genotypes implanted in Eldorado do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul, 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 1.	<p>This Journal Paper is scientifically robust and technically sound. The Topic, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, 3 Tables, 3 Figures, Conclusion and References are all of acceptable standard. However, very few amendments could be suggested.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This article could be put in the acceptable format for this Journal, Topic, Abstract, Keywords, Tables, Figures and References could be put and labelled appropriately. Previous Journal Paper Of this Journal (JEAI) could be downloaded and used as a guide. 2. In Line 19, numbering of references within the text and at the back could start together as [1] and continue orderly. In Lines 204 – 261, REFERENCES could be arranged not in alphabetical order but in the order that they appear in the main body of this write up. 3. Figures and Tables could be appropriately labelled (in bold) where necessary. 	<p>As requested, this article was put in the acceptable format for this Journal. The references were organized in the order that they appear in the main body of this write up. Figures and Tables was appropriately labelled in bold.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Lines 2 - 4 : Topic could be put as - Litter under Potential <i>Eucalypts</i> Genotype Stands in Tree Plantations in Eldorado do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil <p>ABSTRACT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In Line 13 : Keywords could be put as – <i>Keywords: Litter biomass, Leaves, Eucalyptus genotype stands, Sustainability.</i> 3. In Line 61: Could explain as – G = ? 4. In Line 63: Heading could be moved below the maps to Line 66 5. In Line 97: Heading could be moved below to Line 110 and put ' B': as follows – Figure 2. A: Canopy of a stand of <i>Eucalyptus</i> sp; B: Deposition of the litter on the soil; and C: Removal of the litter on the soil for quantification 6. Line 116: Could remove 's' as follows - 3.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 7. Line 157: Heading could be moved below as follows – Figure 3. Relative litter of different <i>Eucalyptus</i> genotypes 8. Line 182 : Could delete 's' as follows - 4. CONCLUSION 	<p>The article was modified as suggested by the reviewers. All changes in text are marked with yellow.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Good work.</p>	<p>Thanks.</p>



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	