



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_50667
Title of the Manuscript:	Floristic analysis and phytosociology in an area of Caatinga
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>References References need to be restructured, as have many errors. We must take into account the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Respect the alphabetical order of the authors.• Record the date (year) of publication, after the names of the authors, or end of the reference.• The following references were not reported in the literature .: Prado, 2003; Vasconcelos et al, 2017.; Nascimento et al . , 2008; APG II system (2003); Dias et al, 2014.; Leite et al, 2015.; Rodal (2002); Trovão, 2004; Holland et al. (2015); Struck et al. (2006);• The following references were not mentioned in the text: Days et al, 2014.; Netherlands et al, 2015.; We JR and Rodal (2002); Birth et al . , 2008; Taken et al . , 2006; DMBM, 2004; Zakia et al., 1998. <p>The results on “distribution of Basal Area (BA), Actual Volume (VA) and Stacked Volume (VS) for diameter class,” lack the statistical support (standard deviation).</p>	Done
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 18 add the following words to the Keywords: “Phytosociology”</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHOD</p> <p>Study Area</p> <p>Line 62: Change “The area is located at 08°21'29 S and 42°14'48" W,” to “The area is located at 08°21'29 S latitude and 42°14'48" W logitude,”..</p> <p>Line 78: Change “(Aguiar; Gomes, 2004)” to “(Aguiar and Gomes, 2004).”</p> <p>Line 90: Change “(Felfili; Rezende, 2003)” to “(Felfili and Rezende, 2003)”</p> <p>Record altitude of the study area. Present the characteristics of the vegetation of the study site, highlighting the dominant species.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>Lines 138-139: Change “(Calixto Júnior; Drumond, 2014; Dias et al., 2014; Leite et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2017b)”, to “(Calixto Júnior and Drumond, 2014; Dias et al., 2014; Leite et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2017b).</p> <p>Move the following paragraph at the bottom of Table 3: “The values are in descending order of IVI. Where N = number of individuals, FA = Absolute Frequency (%), FR = Relative Frequency (%), DA = Absolute Density (ind.ha⁻¹), DR = Relative Density (%), DoA= Absolute Dominance (m².ha⁻¹), DoR= Relative Dominance (%), IVI = Importance Value Index (%), CVI”</p> <p>Lines 214-215: Change “Considering the sum of the basal area of the individuals per hectare, the value found in this study was greater than that found by Santos et al. (2017b),</p>	Correction made in the manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(7.6 m ² .ha ⁻¹)” to “Considering the sum of the basal area of the individuals per hectare, the value found in this study was greater than (7.6 m ² .ha ⁻¹), that found by Santos et al. (2017b),”	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	