



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_30662
Title of the Manuscript:	Zooplankton: A Valuable Environmental Indicator Tool in Reservoir Ecological Management?
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Ms_AJEE_30662 numbered manuscript has been accepted with major revision. Please clarify the Plagiarism: Related proof attached.	Thank you for your rigorous work. But as a matter of fact, I am the 1st author of the present manuscript. Therefore, it is perfectly normal that around 32% of the present manuscript is reflected in other papers of which I am also the first author. Methodological issues are similar, the studied ecosystems are the same and my writing style is also the same (English is not my mother tongue, so my vocabulary is, naturally, a little bit scarce and I'm always writing in the same way). Nevertheless, I want to stress some aspects: - J. Castro et al. (2010) cited a paper of mine from 2003 (see references in J. Castro et al 2010). - E. Jeppesen et al (2011): it is true it is cited in the present manuscript (lines 18-25); however, at the end of the citation one can find the corresponding reference: (7). It also should be stressed that the citation it is not a "copy and past" of E. Jeppesen et al (2011) text. - F. Wawrik (1966). As a matter of fact authors do not know this work. It seems an identification key for zooplankton. We do not understand why some species include in table 1, were considered to be a plagiarism of this author. The mentioned species were



SDI Review Form 1.6

		referenced for this reservoir and simply mentioned in the manuscript. So, talking about plagiarism in this issue is at least ridiculous. These species are certainly referenced for many other reservoirs and lakes in a plenty of published manuscripts. - Authors 6,7,9: Nothing to say. The program for detected plagiarism signed ordinary sentences that could have be written by anyone.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor revision comments attached.	Keywords. I changed the order. But not by alphabetic order... the order is concerning with the relevance of each keyword and not with the alphabet. Dates of the study are mentioned in lines 75-78. Suggestions for changing table 1 were fully accepted. It was added to the discussion a nouvelle paragraph.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		