Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_47738
Title of the Manuscript:	Biodiversity in Forest Fragments Under Different Forms of Environmental Conservation
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	**Title** 1. Add country name to title **Abstract** 2. Start Abstract with problem statement sentence – what led to this investigation for this area? **Introduction** 3. In the current situation the environment makes necessary the sum of efforts to better understand the dynamic interplay between man and environment. The growing environmental awareness and the expansion of knowledge between the different knowledge areas have mobilized the scientific community and the population in favor of getting to know these interaction man/environment [1] and design strategies for the sustainable exploitation of the environment by man. - This paragraph does not provide a high level of quality and important information that is vital to understand the rest of the paper 4. To quantify the quality of habitat for wildlife is a task that is extremely challenging, this being essential to the development of quantitative techniques with robustness sufficient to express the real ability of the natural shelters [10]. - This paragraph does not provide a high level of quality and important information that is vital to understand the rest of the paper 5. It would have been much more helpful if the Introduction could have focused on the three types of areas: (1) reforested conditions, (2) natural remnant area and (3) natural regeneration area and showed how these transitional areas interact, relate and impact on their BIODIVERSITY. What are the various processes that drive them, what are the timelines and changes that we can expect in the short, medium and long term in these areas. How does conservation relate to them, what ecosystem services do they provide. Etc etc. The focus of the Introduction should be on these 3 types of area, not methodology - readers need to know the DYNAMICS of these three types of areas = This mean 3 separate paragraphs, one for each type of area. 6. The focus of this investigation is NOT on the applied methodology – rather the outcome/results of the applied methodology 7. Indicate the level of anthropogenic influence of the three areas under study. Thus provide the ultimate problem statement (e.g. various levels of human impact in the three areas necessitate different management regimes to conserve the native biodiversity, yet promote sustainable utilization of ecosystem services) that led to the initiation of this investigation in the study area. 8. Indicate the value of this investigation for the area under study **Methodology** 9. We never indicate how we presented the data – it can be obviously seen in the next section 10. The areas covered by the study, consisting of 720 m2 each (1) how is it possible that the 3 areas are EXACTLY the same size? (2) 720 m2 = a area of approximately 20x36 m?? – are you sure this is 720 m2 and not 720 km2 – recheck the size of the various areas under investigation 11. why do we ABSOLUTELY NEED to know the environmental conditions if no result OR discussion refer back to it – thus giving context – seems rather meaningless? Do we lose any vital connection or understanding of the results if we remove it? 12. The research was conducted in a completely randomized design (DIC), and the treatments represented by three forest fragments **[16 – WHY CITE THIS REFERENCE? DOES IT SPECIFICALLY REFER TO THE THREE FRAGMENT UNDER STUDY?]** with three replicates. To define the sample unit, the fragments	

were divided into three parts of ≈240 m2 **(1) were these "parts/units" transects or quadrats? (2) What were lengths? (3) HOW WERE THEY PLACED (RANDOM, AT THE CORNERS?),** where each one represented a repetition **(you cannot say this!! You have not conclusively established if the area in the various fragments were homogenous – most probably they were not if they were variously impacted by humans or relief or soil or different ecozones or vegetation communities**. In each fragment, three visits **(indicate the 3 dates of April when visits were made)** were carried out at different times, the first being at 08:00, the second at 12:00, and the third at 16:00 hours, in a randomized way between the sample units. **Indicate how long was the observational time (1 hour, 2 hours?).**

13. "The collection of vegetation information was carried out based on specialized literature [19] **This does not indicate the applied methodology on the vegetation in general - correct**, and two **(dominant?)** tree species **(1) indicate how these 2 tree species were sampled (2) motivate why other species were specifically excluded from the sampling design – especially if they have an impact on the observed fauna)** are commonly found in the transition areas of the Atlantic Forest and Cerrado"

Results
Too extensive to be presented as a Short communication paer.

Discussion
14. What specific result are you discussing from the many presented in paragraphs above figures? DISCUSS SPECIFIC RESULTS – WHAT DO THEY MEAN FOR THE AREAS AND CONSERVATION! Keep title of paper in mind. There is a SIGNIFICANT disconnect between results presented and their specific discussion – near all discussion looks like it would fit better in the Introduction.
15. The focus is NOT ON THE METHODOLOGY!! Revisit your title! You are not establishing a NEW methodology for this type of forest areas – focus according to the title should be on the biodiversity under Different Forms of Environmental Conservation

Conclusion
16. Short communications do not have conclusion section – this information should be worked into the various sections.

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
	17. Map of study area? 18. Journal guidelines: There is no strict page limit for a Short Communication; however, we advise a length of 2500-3500 words, plus 2-3 figures and/or tables 19. For additional issues refer to the accompanied reviewed manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is a mixed format of short communication (SEE SHORTENED INTRODUCTION AND THE COMBINATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION) AND FULL RESEARCH PAPER (SEE NUMBER OF TABLES AND FIGURES PRESENTED) – DECIDE IF YOU ARE PRESENTING a short communication OR full research paper AND ADHERE TO THAT FORMAT IN PRESENTION ONLY. Guideline for Reporting P values: P is always italicized and capitalized. i) Correct expression: (P = .05). Wrong Expression: (P < .05), unless P < .001. ii) The P value should be expressed to 2 digits whether or not it is significant. If P < .01, it should be expressed to 3 digits. iii) When rounding, 3 digits is acceptable if rounding would change the significance of a value (eg, P = .049 rounded to .05). iv) Expressing P to more than 3 significant digits does not add useful information since precise P values with extreme results are sensitive to biases or departures from the statistical model. v) Reporting actual P values avoids this problem of interpretation. P values should not be listed as not significant (NS) since, for meta-analysis, the actual values are important and not providing exact P values is a form of incomplete reporting. vi) Do not use 0 before the decimal point for statistical values P, alpha, and beta because they cannot equal 1	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Martin Potgieter*
Department, University & Country	*University of Limpopo, South Africa*