



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_30661
Title of the Manuscript:	Zooplankton Community Structure in a Deep Reservoir: Seasonal Trends and Structuring Variables
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	There are at least four weaknesses in the manuscript: 1. The composition or amount of phytoplankton of this reservoir are mentioned or discusses several times, but I can't see that the author or others (in References) have investigated this part of the ecosystem in 2010-2011 (except for chlorophyll-analyzes). 2. Several of the environmental variables listed in Table 1 have very high detection limits. Therefore they will have very low relevance when characterizing or discussing the environmental conditons (spcial, inter-annual and/or seasonal variations). I miss variables like total N and total P with suitable detection limits that could reflect real environmental variations. 3. When trying to explain the mesotrophic to eutrophic conditions of the reservoir, it seems to me that only the water level fluctuations is taken into account as an impact factor. In my opinion the author should discuss if there are other major impact factors that could be relevant (variations in run off, point sources etc.). 4. Water level fluctuations are pointed out as the main impact factor. These fluctuations should be illustrated by a table or graph or both.	1) Please see the rewritten manuscript. 2) These variables due to their low relevance because the used detections limits were excluded from the nouvelle version of the manuscript. 3 , 4) Now the approach is different.
Minor REVISION comments	Row 14: .."Portugal where in the climates" Drop the "in"? Row 16-17: I think the autor means the opposite: that the freshwater systems may be significantly affected by watershed geology, climate and so on. Row 41: I suggest that the total number of sampling dates should mentionned.	The abstract was rewritten.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Row 45-46: Are these environmental variables just estimated, or are were they analyzed chemically? Row 80: "pH and CHL a concentrations" Row 86: According to Table 1 there were no variations in several of the environmental variables values throug the sampling period at stations P2 and P3 in 2011. This seems very strange. Sampled only once? As mentioned above: too high detection limits for NO3 and phosphorus to say anything about variations. Row 100: I think Daphnia as a group not should be characterized as a coarse mesh filter-feeder (see Reference 9). Row 170: I think this statement should be followed by some reference(s). Row 193-194: I can't see that the author or others have taken samples of the phytoplankton in the reservoir in 2010-2011. Row 199-200: The water level fluctuations should be shown by a graph for exsample. Row 225: "climate change" implicatons on the zooplankton is not discussed in the above text, so I do not understand that this should be a part of the conclusion.	Done. Were analysed but with too high detection limits in the nouvelle version of the manuscript they were not considered due to their low relevance (they are important variables to understand the dynamic of zooplankton community but they lost relevance due to detection limits) Results and discussion were rewritten.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In some parts of the manuscript the English language should be improved a bit.	