



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_50026
Title of the Manuscript:	EDAPHIC FACTORS AND FLOODING PERIODICITY DETERMINING FOREST TYPES IN A TOPOGRAPHIC GRADIENT IN THE NORTHERN BRAZILIAN AMAZONIA
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>First, thanks for the invitation to review this paper. The authors in the paper present some edaphic attributes in a topographic gradient located in the Amazonian region of Brazil. In general, it's a good work with interesting information, with a clear introduction.</p> <p>There are many English mistakes, please check the English with a native speaker.</p> <p>The presentation of the result must be improved. Also, the conceptual model used in the study should be rebuilt.</p> <p>The authors use the concept "physical soil attributes" but the only present the soil texture. Please use correctly the concepts. If you say physic soil attributes you have to show bulk density, particle density among other, and not only the soil texture.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 51-55. It's a poor statement, please rewrite it.</p> <p>Line 81: "Also <u>can</u> be considered"</p> <p>Line 120: BRAZIL-MME, 1975. Please use a more recent reference</p> <p>Line 126-130. Mention all the type of soil is not a relevant information. If you hava a soil map maybe you can use it as a supplementary material</p> <p>Line 134-148: Font style is different. Please correct it.</p> <p>Line 145: "conceptual model" what is this ? Its not clear, please explain better how did you build the model, using which methodology ? Where do you show the result of the model ?</p> <p>Line 155: Replace by: (sand, silt and clay percentages)</p> <p>Figure 2. Please changes the photos A and B, use as a example the photo C (this on is much better)</p> <p>Line 170: where is the Virúa National Park ? Please put the location and be clear in the comparison.</p> <p>Title of the figure 3 must be placed down and not in the top of the figure.</p> <p>Figure 3. I understand that this is a "conceptual model". However, its not a clear model. There are not scales and explanatory legend. For example. What does it mean the red color ? Which soil deep are you representing? It look like a forest with a poor vegetation diversity. Please use the scientific name of the species that you are showing in the model. See this literature with some examples: 1) Dinâmica físico-hídrica de uma topossequência de solos sob savana florestada (cerradão) em assis, SP. 2) Soil functioning in a toposequence under rainforest in São Paulo, Brazil</p> <p>Table 1. The title must be placed in the top. I can't see all the data in the table. Also is a big table that can be split in two tables to present the result.</p> <p>Table 2. Explain what is ArT ArG ArF</p> <p>The vegetation parameters are poorly related and discussed with the soil and flood periodicity. Please enrich this discussion</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 332: "which" Some references are in red color, I don't know why. Please correct it.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sergio Esteban Lozano Baez
Department, University & Country	University of São Paulo, Brazil