



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_46619
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil seed bank in Tropical Rainforest inserted in agricultural matrix, Northeast Region of 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>)

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	<p>Title: The title is very good but there is an omission of a word "the"; It should be Soil Seed Bank in the Tropical Rainforest Inserted in Agricultural Matrix, Northeast Region of Brazil {see the reviewed manuscript for appropriate option}.</p> <p>Keywords: The use of "seed rain" is inappropriate. It should be replaced with seed bank. Also, additional keyword e.g. agricultural matrix will make more meaning to the work {see the reviewed manuscript for more options}.</p> <p>Figures: The titles on Fig. 1 & 2 are poorly structured. There is need to separate each title from the source. {See details on the reviewed manuscript for appropriate options}.</p> <p>Tables: The titles on Tables 1, 2 & 3 and sources of data are not properly organized for easy comprehension. Some of the details ought to be in the discussion {see details on the reviewed manuscript}.</p> <p>Acronyms: Some cases exist where acronyms wrongly presented and some used where not necessary e.g. Table 2; paragraph two under the Sampling seed Bank {See the manuscript for appropriate correction}</p>	<p>Title: we agree with the reviewer.</p> <p>Keywords: we agree with the reviewer.</p> <p>Figures: we agree with the reviewer.</p> <p>Tables: we agree with the reviewer.</p> <p>Acronyms: we removed the acronyms. They were in Portuguese</p>
Minor REVISION comments	There are some cases of sentence/grammatical errors in the work e.g. paragraph one and two of the study area; the third paragraph under Sampling of the Seed Bank; the first paragraph/sentence under Data Analysis; captioning of each Table and Figure. { see the reviewed manuscript for details }	
Optional/General comments	This is a very good research manuscript. However, the researcher(s) need to correct all the grammatical and technical issues identified in the manuscript.	

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)	No, there are not.