SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_46658**
Title of the Manuscript:	**FLORISTIC AND PHYTOOSOCIOLOGICAL SURVEY IN A CAATINGA FRAGMENT UNDER EXTENSIVE GRAZING IN PATOS-PB MUNICIPALITY**
Type of the 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	**The manuscript is well organized and have many useful information's. However, authors should discuss why their findings are important. There is no proper discussion on text. However, introduction section should be reorganized. They are suddenly jump on their research in first sentence rather that literature information's. The reference citations on text is not appropriate. It should be reorganized. Especially numbering is wrong. It should be follow numerical order. they are starts with abnormal citations number (10s).**	We reviewed the corrections regarding the introduction and agreed that it really was getting a bit off the main focus of the research. Because of this, we practically re-read every introduction following what was suggested, we now expect the changes made to meet what was requested. Thank you for your cooperation.
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should be carefully edited manuscript for both literature information and numbering format.	We analyzed and really were not inserted in the work correctly, but we have already identified the errors and re-made the corrections as requested. We thank the collaborations. .
Optional/General comments		

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)*	does not exist