



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48464
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPONENTS OF TREE BIOMASS IN AN INTEGRATED CROP-LIVESTOCK-FOREST SYSTEM
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Results: Present data on DBH and Height of trees first [see sequence of methodology]</li> <li>2. For additional issues refer to the accompanied edited manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Paragraph 1: should read: Crop-livestock-forest (CLF) integration has been proposed as an economically viable production technology for the recovery and renovation of degraded areas in the Cerrados, a vast tropical savanna ecoregion of Brazil [indicate authors who proposed this technique]. The main habitat types of the Cerrado include: forest savanna, wooded savanna, park savanna and gramineous-woody savanna. Savanna wetlands and gallery forests are also included [1] - VASCONCELOS, Vitor Vieira; VASCONCELOS, Caio Vieira; VASCONCELOS, Davi Mourão Phyto-Environmental Characterization of Brazilian Savanna (Cerrado) and Brazilian Atlantic Forest, with the Research of Stone Lines and Paleosols Geografia. Ensino &amp; Pesquisa (UFSM), v. 14, p. 3, 2010.]</li> <li>4. Also present a broad outline of what this technique entail in Paragraph 1.</li> <li>5. Paragraph 2 should just focus on the benefits of CLF systems</li> <li>6. Paragraph 3: Expand this paragraph focusing on Eucalyptus as part of a CLF</li> <li>7. However, this competition can be reduced by selecting genetic material, adapting the planting arrangement of the tree component, and silvicultural treatments, which, in addition to adding value to the wood, also allows for greater light entry into the integration system that contributes to the maintenance or increase in the productivity of the other components" [such as?]"</li> <li>8. Format citations as: Clemente [7] verified, not as [7] verified – correct throughout paper.</li> <li>9. For additional issues refer to the accompanied edited manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Tables/figures should be numbered 1, 2, 3 ... not, 2.1, 2.2. etc.</li> <li>11. For additional issues refer to the accompanied edited manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. This is a Full research paper – where results and discussion are separate sections – please correct by using the same headings in the same sequence in both sections.</li> <li>13. This paper do not present adequate discussion of the numerous results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are reasons for the findings?</li> <li>• Are the findings in line with similar studies?</li> <li>• What are the impacts of the results?</li> <li>• What conclusions can be drawn?</li> <li>• What recommendations can be proposed?</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b><i>These areas are lacking in near all results that needs discussion and should be rectified throughout the discussion section. This would totally change the complexion of the discussion and conclusion sections.</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. "This is contrary to the expected behavior in more homogeneous forest stands where trees with higher heights and smaller diameters are observed" - indicate</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>studies were this was observed.</p> <p>15. "Generally, resource availability tends to be higher [where?], reflecting higher growth in broader [less dense?] plantations [15]. This fact can be observed in this study because in spite of the densification of the trees in the planting lines, the spacing between the eucalyptus ridges provides greater light availability in this integrated CLF system. This causes the effect observed in the height [indicate studies were this was correlation was observed], DBH [indicate studies were this was correlation was observed], and wood volume [indicate studies were this was correlation was observed] that can be attributed more to the lesser effect of resource competition than to continuous plantings where the height and DBH ratio are inversely related" (indicate graph/figure and R-value to illustrate this statement). [Are the findings in line with similar studies, what are the impact of the results, what conclusions can be drawn, what recommendations can be proposed. - This is not adequate as a discussion]</p> <p>16. "In their study with a silvipastoral system in the region of Coronel Pacheco/MG, [add author name][26] tested"</p> <p>17. For additional issues refer to the accompanied edited manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Martin Potgieter</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Limpopo, South Africa</b>