



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript sought to evaluate the structure of the zooplankton community in a reservoir in Portugal in response to seasonal and environmental variation. However, the manuscript has several inconsistencies and inconsistent data. First, the study title does not reflect what is described in the text: there is no correlation of the environmental variables to the data obtained by seasonality, nor is there a discussion of the impact of these variables on the zooplankton community structure. The introduction of the manuscript has problems of textual cohesion and structuring, and does not address any ecological theory on the subject of the study. The objectives of the study differ from what was written in the Title, and both were not properly argued in the Discussion. In Material and Methods, it is missing the description of the study area. Figure 1 depicting the map of the area in question has serious errors, such as the lack of geographic coordinates and metric scale. The other methodological descriptions require more detailed information. The study discussion does not follow the initial proposal described in the title and later in the objectives of the study. The arguments are restricted in Cyanobacteria data, which were not measured in the samples of the study in question, and for this reason they lose their validity. There is no discussion about the relationship between environmental variables and the abundances and richness of the zooplankton community,	Thanks for the valuable comments. The manuscript was rewritten and improved. Authors tried to erase and eliminate all the inconsistencies.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	nor does the text quote the conditions of the aquatic communities of reservoirs and their impacts. Finally, there is no correlation between seasonality and environmental variations. Fleeing totally from the initial proposal of the work.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Lines 3-4: The title of the paper is inconsistent with the content described in the study. There are no correlations between zooplankton structure and environmental variations. There are only isolated results without discussing the influences of environmental variables on the community, and the difference between them between summer and winter. Lines 14-26: The introduction has no cohesion in its paragraphs. I suggest recasting it, addressing the importance of reservoirs, for example, supply and its negative impacts, as in the aquatic community. To address how these impacts interfere in the zooplankton community, the importance of the same in the aquatic community, including in the manuscript ecological theories that rectify these topics. Lines 27-31: The passage describes the area of study, I suggest that this excerpt be removed from the introduction and added to in the methodology. Lines 31-33: The title of the text indicates that the work will assess the structural change of the zooplankton community seasonally. However, this is not described in the objectives of the paper. Lines 34-36: On figure 1, I suggest the removal of the photo, as well as the topics with the characteristics of the reservoir. It is necessary to insert the area of study in the form of illustration and not as a photo of Google. The photo taken from Google, in my view, was misused. In addition, the map needs to have metric scale and geographic coordinates and with discriminated study points.	The title was changed as well as the key words The introduction was deeply changed. Done changed Done
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 38: It is necessary to insert in Material and Methods a topic called Study Area, where using the data of the table of figure 1 and the introduction section (lines 27-31), cohesively, in a text describing the area. Line 48: There is no description of how the water was collected, whether it was by suction pump or by using buckets, nor the amount of water filtered for each sample. These data are fundamental for the analysis of the abundance and wealth of the zooplankton community. Line 51: Not all organisms were identified up to the species level. Line 54: It is necessary to describe which months integrate each station studied, since the work approaches the seasonal change. To facilitate the understanding of the results obtained in each of them. I suggest inserting a variation of temperature in each season. Line 74: The study did not analyze the spatial or inter-annual variations by statistical analysis, and for this reason it has no basis for stating that the data were not relevant. Lines 83-84: Figure 1 presents a chart with data on the Aguilera reservoir, and one of them cites that it is eutrophic. Therefore, either the information in this section is wrong, or the information in the table in figure 1 is. Is the reservoir just eutrophic? Or depending on the period studied there is variation in degree and trophy? Lines 95-101: The stretch is not cohesive. I suggest that it be rewritten, emphasizing the comparison of the data	Done Methodology was rewritten Changed Done We disagree Changed
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	obtained in each seasonality, for both richness and abundance (adding the average values of abundance and richness corresponding to the summer and winter months). Highlighting, if there are, the species that were found exclusively in each season. In this way, the reader will be able to understand where the highest rates of abundance and wealth were obtained.	Changed
	Line 100: Considering that the authors themselves state that the type of network mesh used in the study affects the abundance of the sample, then the study sample is not being underestimated? And Daphnia has on average a larger size than the rotifers, and so if the abundance of the same was affected by the mesh network, then it is deduced that the abundance and richness of the rotifers was also.	We do not think so.
	Lines 126-128: In Table 2, remove the bold of the species of rotifers.	Removed
	Lines 136-165: Figure 4, the data of this figure is not discussed in the text at any time. Thus, either the same must be removed from work, or inserted the section that describes it.	Changed
	Line 170: In which given, the authors were based to affirm that the mentioned species have those preferences? And this type of argumentation must be in the Discussion topic, not in results.	Changed
	Line 179: Electrical Conductivity	Changed
	Lines 180-181: Why were these variables not listed in the discussion topic?	Results were rewritten some topic were exclude.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 192-198: All arguments written by the authors in this passage refer to Cyanobacteria. However, the study in question did not analyze the algal biomass to make such arguments. How can the authors state that the algal biomass of these collections presented predominance of Cyanobacteria? In this way, this statement can not be considered valid. Lines 206-208: The study in question, too, did not analyze data on fish predation, so the argument of this section is not valid. Lines 209-217: Again, the authors re-address arguments based on data on Cyanobacteria that were not analyzed by the study. Excerpt without validity. Line 217: I suggest comparing the data found in the study with other reservoirs, and discussing the specific conditions of these aquatic communities. Lines 222-223: The importance and impact of these variables in the zooplankton community are not discussed in any part of the manuscript. Lines 223-226: What were the data analyzed by the study demonstrating the degree of anthropogenic disturbance? The authors based on what results to describe such a conclusion?	The discussion as well as the conclusion have been rewritten.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	For all these reasons described above, I consider that the manuscript has serious fragilities that need to be reviewed by the authors and deficiencies can be repaired.	