



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAERI_16154
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of the layout of a line of high voltage (HTA) on the flora of the locality of Agboville in the South-east of the Côte d'Ivoire
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Revise the paper accordingly. I have attached some research papers for your kind concern. These papers will be helpful to you while revising the paper. Add the references as I have mentioned in the MS which will strengthen your paper.	The document at summer revised like wished it the reviewer. The joined documents were exploited. But even if the texts give us many information, the topic approached is the impact of fire on nature. These documents helped us to improve quality of the article. The language was re-examined by a linguist. The required job was done. but I did not quote the authors of the two attached articles which speaks about impact but which does not fit in the same context of work. But we re-examined the references as it has it request (see the text this part was put in blue). All the observations were now taken into account
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper is interesting as I have mentioned. I have made the comments directly on the MS.	The minor corrections were carried out by taking into account the remarks in the MS
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is interesting but poorly written. Re- write it and revise as per comments made in the MS. I have also attached herewith some of the research papers for the authors which will be helpful while revising the MS.	The article was enriched by taking into account the attached documents