



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48721
Title of the Manuscript:	Natural Regeneration and Ecological Succession in an Urban Fragment of the Atlantic Forest in Pernambuco, 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	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar poor – see accompanied edited manuscript <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar poor – see accompanied edited manuscript “However, over the past 50 years (up to 2015), the original coverage of this biome has been reduced to 8% [4], cause by the advanced stage of fragmentation caused by the anthropogenic” activities such as ... [indicate activities] (cite source). Cannot have all these small paragraphs focussing on regeneration – all info related to regeneration must be contained in one paragraph only. The weighting (amount of information supplied) between regeneration and succession is not equal – please correct. Nothing is stated for fragmentation - cause and effect <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar poor – see accompanied edited manuscript “384.4 hectares, going to 1,157.72 hectares” - unclear - how big is this fragment? “14 hectares are occupied by the zoo” - indicate name of Zoo. Figure 1 – not displaying! “The study was carried out in the new area of PEDI” - define new area <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar poor – see accompanied edited manuscript “In the survey of the natural regeneration of the tree species” - in the methodology it MUST be stated that only trees were part of the study, not shrubs] “...in the implanted portion” - define this portion “Two of these families of higher representativity were also found in a study of natural regeneration of native tree species in sub-forest of Eucalyptus saligna Smith [26].” - Discuss reason(s) for the abundance of these families, What conclusions can be drawn, what recommendations can you make? In relation to the phytosociological structure, the seven species of greatest Importance Value were ... made up 54.1% of the total Value of Importance (VI) (Table 2).” - Discuss reason(s) for the abundance of these species. The representativeness of these species was also highlighted ...PEDI fragment.” - What characteristic makes them to be successful? What conclusions can be drawn in terms of veld management, what management recommendations can be make? The families that presented the highest number of species, orderly in descending order were: ... The importance of the Fabaceae family is emphasized... - What about the other families, what makes them to be important? “The three species that have the highest VI stand out due to the high values of density and dominance in the area, Myrcia guianensis was the one with the highest values for all the estimated parameters. – Indicate possible reasons? “The ecophysiological and environmental characteristics in which the species are inserted, some may not reach large diameters [32].” - Explain this statement – why not? All are native species of the Atlantic Forest biome ... almost all plots.” - What makes these species to be successful in the study area? “Of the total sampled, 7 species were not classified” - Give reason for not classifying them. 	<p>Correction made in the abstract section</p> <p>Correction done</p> <p>Revision made in the manuscript</p> <p>We have made the correction as per the comments</p> <p>Correction made in the manuscript</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>23. Below Figure 3 - Combine these 4 small (1 sentence each) paragraphs into one larger paragraph – a paragraph cannot consist of one sentence only.</p> <p>24. “In relation to regeneration by height class, the percentages were: 35.10%, 30.38% and 34.51%, for classes 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Of the 46 species sampled, 15 were found in the three classes, 10 species in two classes and 21 species only in one height class (Figure 4).” DISCUSS THIS RESULT – WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR SUCCESSION?</p> <p>25. “While in Class 3 height, the following stand out: Chamaecrista ensiformis (4.13%), Myrcia guianensis (3.83%), Xylopia frutescens (3.54%) and Pogonophora schomburgkiana (3.24%).” - DISCUSS THIS RESULT – WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR SUCCESSION?</p> <p>26. “With this, it can be seen that a community that presents high diversity is directly related to its richness [40].” - DISCUSS THIS RESULT – WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR SUCCESSION?</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>27. SHORT COMMUNICATION PAPERS DO NOT AS A RULE HAVE CONCLUSION SECTION – RATHER INCORPORATE THESE INSIGHTS INTO THE ABOVE TEXT.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	For additional issues refer to the accompanied edited manuscript.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	