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Dear reviewer,

We kindly ask you to fill this form after the critical reading of the manuscript under evaluation. Please give us your opinion regarding the relevance of its publication in Oecologia Australis, considering the criteria set out in this form. We recommend that the suggestions, changes and corrections are entered directly in the manuscript file, using the "tracking changes control" and "comments" in Microsoft Word or similar. Alternatively, suggestions, changes and corrections can be inserted in the text boxes that comprise this form. For questions, please contact us.

kind regards,

Editorial staff

1) Does the title adequately reflect the content of the manuscript? \*

XYes

No

2) Is the manuscript a relevant scientific contribution to ecology? \*

Yes

XNo

*Almost every recommendation made by reviewers in the manuscript was considered and modified. We hope we are closer to what it was expected from the reviewer.*

3) Does the summary present the main idea of the manuscript and its objectives and main results and conclusions? \*

XYes

No

4) Are the keywords pertinent and different from the words used in the manuscript title? \*

XYes

No

5) Does the introduction present the theoretical/empirical content in which the manuscript topic is inserted? \*

Yes

XNo

*Introduction has been modified trying to add more specific information and linking paragraphs within it. New cites were added.*

*We tried to cope with Whelan´s definitions regarding information vacancy areas (please see introduction); specifically the second (b) and third (c) premise. “Según Whelan (1995) el estudio de poblaciones y comunidades en sitios quemados debe apuntar a buscar información de los factores que regulan tres procesos principales: a) mortalidad de adultos; b) densidad de la germinación/rebrote luego del incendio, y c) establecimiento de propágulos y sobrevivencia en el tiempo.”. This is the basic background in which we were based for the development of the present work.*

6) Are the methods adequate and clearly presented? \*

XYes

No

7) Are the results, discussion and conclusion clearly presented and do they correctly address the objectives of the study? \*

Yes

XNo

Several changes were made to results and discussion.

*Analizing the hipothesis and the objective, conclusions were suited according to these:*

***Hypothesis:*** *“La hipótesis planteada es que existen grupos de especies con habilidades adaptativas diferentes para la colonización del suelo en el corto plazo pos-fuego…,”;* ***Conclusion****: “Las especies dominantes encontradas (Acacia aroma, Acalypha communis, Cantinoa mutabilis, Cyperus rotundus, Nothoscordum gracile, Parthenium hysterophorus L., Setaria spp. y Sida argentina) presentan todas buena capacidad de rebrote y germinación debido a su forma de vida terófita, hemicriptófita y geófita.”*

***Hypothesis:*** *“… debido a cambios ecológicos tales como aumento en la fertilidad química y luminosidad, y reducción en la competencia interespecífica sobre estas especies colonizadoras.” ;* ***Conclusion****:* “*A pesar del incendio, la recuperación de la cobertura vegetal fue rápida debido a que el mismo fue de baja intensidad y el suelo contenía una buena cantidad de carbono orgánico y mayor provisión de nitrógeno y fósforo disponible respecto al testigo.”*

8) Are all the figures and tables essential and self-explanatory? \*

xYes

No

9) Are the references pertinent and up-to-date? \*

XYes

No

10) Final Considerations:

The paper analyzes the post-fire revegetation in the Natural Reserve La Defensa, Córdoba, Argentina.

I consider the paper needs a detailed revision: in grammar, redaction, words repetition in the same paragraph, etc.

Conclusions: this item requires more attention, avoiding repeating expressions used in Results.

I have indicated in the same text some suggestions.

I consider that the text could be published after a thorough revision.

*Several changes were made thanks to the reviewer´s suggestions. We appreciate reviewer´s effort to let us know many details in the manuscript.*