

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_77517
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantification of Root Biomass in Post-Mining Areas in the Municipality of Capitão Poço – PA, 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors have made an effort in the manuscript that is presented. In my opinion, the article is interesting. However, the authors have not shown the full scope of the research and the manuscript requires important corrections, I list my comments below:</p> <p>1-The contribution of the article is not described, nor is its conceptual novelty, revision, or use in the practice of any discipline mentioned.</p> <p>2- The abstract does not clearly reflect the content of the manuscript. It is suggested to incorporate a structured summary: introduction, description of the methodology, presentation of results, and some relevant results.</p> <p>3. The introduction is quite short, a theoretical framework is not presented, nor are the antecedents that show the importance of the research carried out. At the end of the introduction, the authors must include a paragraph where they describe the novelty and content of the article.</p> <p>4-It is necessary to document the case study with some figures that show the geographical location, the characteristics of the study area, the collection or analysis of samples, a soil and roots profile, among other factors that reflect the reality of the case of study.</p> <p>5-In the results, the authors must show the importance of this case study, what is it for? can it be replicated? contributes to scientific research? to public policies? which sector benefits?</p> <p>6-The presentation of results is minimal, with 3 unit figures all the results of the research are shown, which suggests that it is a popular article, rather than a research one. The authors could systematize the results and show the greater scope of this research.</p> <p>7-The authors must carry out an extensive discussion and compare their case study with similar cases that are already reported in the specialty literature.</p> <p>8-The conclusion does not clearly reflect what has been done in the manuscript, it is necessary to modify it and show the most relevant contributions of this research.</p> <p>Authors are recommended to improve the structure and content of their manuscript in order to improve the quality of their research.</p> <p>I hope these comments are useful to the authors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Luis Bernardo López-Sosa
Department, University & Country	Universidad Intercultural Indígena, México