



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_43338
Title of the Manuscript:	Different Type of Ant Species Nests in Periyanaickenpalyam Village, Coimbatore District, TamilNadu
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Content and scientific soundness of the study is moderate, however the author(s), are kindly requested to improve quality of the text. Tittle should be revised and read 'Diversity of Ant Species (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) Nesting in different trees in Periyanaickenpalyam, TamilNadu. This may lead to major revision of the manuscript both descriptive and inferential statistics aspects.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>I am not quite sure whether lack of spacing in this manuscript was due to handling distortion during the submission process or careless of the author(s). For example, starting page 1, line 9 to line 17 there is problem of spacing. Besides, the abstract doesn't capture attention of readers and it lacks logical flow of ideas.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>This part is poorly written and most of the references cited are too old and doesn't reflect the reality. For example, in page 1, line 23 sentence which say...there about 15000 species of ants [1] only 11,769 species have been described [2]. This is not the fact, I suggest the author(s) to read Lach et al., 2009 and other related scholars. The estimated number of ant species range between 25,000 and 30,000, currently more than 12,500 species have been described, this accounts for less than 1% of all described insect species (Bolton et al., 2006). Somewhere author(s) refers Formicinae as a family while it is just a subfamily within the family Formicidae.</p> <p>I also expect this part to have flow of ideas by linking the title, research problem, justification for the research, deficiencies in the evidence or gaps i.e. what is missing or what do author(s) need to know more about? The author(s) failed to give clue on introductory words describing methodology approach (i.e. research design). I strongly advise the author(s) to review literature intensively and rewrite the entire section.</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>Study Area</p> <p>Author(s) should establish reason(s) for site selection and avoid duplication of SI units, there is no reason to mention both meters and feet while both describe unit of linear measure (Page 2, line 42). A similar trend also noted in page 2 line 44, millimetre and inch were both used.</p> <p>Collection Method</p> <p>Authors did not provide detailed methodology, which also needs to be supported by sampling design. I thought it is much better if the author(s) should have the following subsections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of study site • All out search method 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sorting • Ant identification • Labelling • Mounting • Preservation (dry and wet if any) • Documentation <p>Data analysis</p> <p>Unfortunately data analysis was presented as measurement of diversity; this entails only descriptive statistics and ignores inferential statistics.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>This section needs major revision to include inferential statistics. Aspect of nesting and species related to trees association could be presented as correlation analysis. Besides author(s) should provide scientific explanations to support their results and later by comparing to other scholars</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Minor revision and editing is required, for example page 6, line169, there is very short sentence. Tree. Author(s) need to rephrase hanging sentence, page 6, line 173, Nesting and species number is rich depending trees association.</p>	
Optional/General comments	Proof reading and editing is required to improve the quality of text	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Moses Olotu
Department, University & Country	Mkwawa University College of Education, Tanzania