



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_39140
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparison of the effects of sika deer on two key ecological drivers controlling populations of silver-studded blue butterflies on lowland heath: larval food sources and mutualistic ants
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>)



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>This paper is interesting and important for management and conservation in Nature Reserves, and in general the study had a good experimental design. However, there are some variables that were not measured and are used for explain the results (see discussion section).</p> <p>The details of the review are described below (and see pdf):</p> <p>Check number of words in the abstract.</p> <p>Use other word instead of preference; to evaluate preference other experiments are required.</p> <p>Some variables were not measured and are used for explain the results in the discussion section. It is necessary to correct.</p> <p>There are current references that could complement the introduction and discussion sections:</p> <p>Available on line:</p> <p>Fernández et al. 2016. Fine Scale Movements of the Butterfly <i>Plebejus argus</i> in a Heterogeneous Natural Landscape as Revealed by GPS Tracking</p> <p>https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10905-016-9543-7.pdf</p> <p>The authors can look for other references.</p>	<p>We thank the reviewer for their detailed feedback here and annotated on the PDF. We respond to all their comments here. We have also added a conclusion as directed by the editor. We have used yellow highlight to indicate changes in the revised manuscript</p> <p>We have shortened the title We have shortened the abstract to 215 words</p> <p>Regarding the comment on the PDF on whether it is possible to estimate the number of individuals from dung pellets - our reply is that unfortunately it is not – it can only be used as a measure of incidence (i.e one animal in the area for 2 days would be indistinguishable from two animals for half a day).</p> <p>We have added a data analysis section to the methods.</p> <p>We have changed “preference” to “for more abundantly” or “habitat use” as appropriate to the text context. We have also moved some text to the discussion sections</p> <p>We have deleted $P < 0.0001$ from the title to Table 1 as it does not occur in the table.</p> <p>In the discussion section we have made it much clearer that we are just suggesting explanations to results when refereeing to variables that we did not measure.</p> <p>We have added the suggested reference and two others to the complement the introduction and discussion sections.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		