



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_50180
Title of the Manuscript:	Variations in total species richness and the unevenness of species abundance distribution between two distant Conus communities (Neogastropoda): a case study in Mannar Gulf (India)
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>)

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>*Replace the keywords that already appear in the title</p> <p>*Better define objectives as actions at the end of the introduction</p> <p>*Provide a general overview of the methods in the article. All that is essential for the understanding of the reader should be noted. Smaller details may be indicated for reading in the article already published.</p> <p>*Expand the discussion with existing models for assessing the proposed indicators</p> <p>*Review writing. When you cite something in the singular in science, it implies that the study was developed by only one person. People who certainly collaborated in collecting, analyzing, reviewing ... do not even go into acknowledgment ...? Here we have an ethical issue.</p> <p>*Only 50% of references are from the last five years. Update.</p>	<p>Thanks for the Review</p> <p>*key words: no <i>key expression</i> is redundant with the Title of the paper</p> <p>* the objective addressed in the paper are clearly listed at the end of the Introduction: see, pasted below, the end part of the Introduction section:</p> <p>"I address the following points, for each two <i>Conus</i> sub-communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the estimated true (total) species richness, - the exhaustive (i.e. numerically completed) distribution of species abundances, with related considerations regarding the kind of process involved in the hierarchical structuring of abundances and the estimated mean competitive intensity within each sub-community, - the relation between species richness and species abundance unevenness, directly derived from the comparison between the two <i>Conus</i> sub-communities, - the degree of dissimilarity in species composition between the two compared sub-communities and what can be deduced in terms of either distance decay in similarity or stochasticity of species recruitment at the local scale (since both causes can possibly contribute to the observed dissimilarity in species composition)." <p>* the Method section of the paper extends from line 83 to line 206, (1427 words), which, indeed, include all that is necessary for the treatment and analysis of data. In order to avoid excessive length of this section, all details regarding the field methodology (that have already been published by Gugulothu R, Raveender B, Kumar Shah T & Koteswar B. in an open-access reference [26]) were not repeated in the present paper.</p> <p>*the specific advantages of the extrapolation procedure implemented in this study to obtain least biased inferences have been already briefly highlighted in the Methods section and do not need to be repeated in the Discussion section which focus on discussing the results themselves.</p> <p>*Field data involved in this study has been reported earlier by Gugulothu R, Raveender B, Kumar Shah T & Koteswar B in reference [26] and this is perfectly clear in the paper. As regard the analytical study, which makes the entire subject of the paper, I am the sole and unique people involved.</p> <p>50% of a total of 64 references makes, yet, something like 32 recent references less than five years, which does not need to be expanded any further.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	See comments	
Optional/General comments		