



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_34392
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION ON ABUNDANCE AND DIVERSITY OF SOIL MACRO-INVERTEBRATES IN IDORO COMMUNITY, AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA
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	1) The Author must discuss that the high dominance of only one taxon (<i>Blaniulus guttulatus</i> - 54.1%) led to the lower value of evenness in the farmland, which in turn was responsible for the lower value of species diversity in this area; 2) The Author must discuss that the values of total abundance and richness were both higher in the farmland because of the presence of five exclusive taxons (<i>Oxidus gracilis</i>, <i>Plectroctena</i> sp., <i>Formica rufa</i>, <i>Cryptocerus punctulatus</i>, and <i>Pycnoscelus surinamensis</i>); 3) The Author must contextualize that the taxons that were excluded from the domestic waste dumpsite are distributed in different trophic guilds, such as decomposers (<i>Oxidus gracilis</i>, <i>Cryptocerus punctulatus</i>, and <i>Pycnoscelus surinamensis</i>) and predators (<i>Plectroctena</i> sp., and <i>Formica rufa</i>). What about this information? 4) Ecosystems with a greater variety of ecological niches are capable of harboring a greater diversity of species, which demonstrates their ecological sustainability. Based on this statement, what could the Author infer about the studied areas? For example, the soil quality would be higher in which area? This approach is fundamental because the present	1. The value is an expression that the taxon is abundance in the farmland and from the calculation of the evenness of the species in the said land, it is deduced that the species in the farmland sampling site are not evenly distributed in terms of abundance. This is an expression that suggests that the sampling site is favourable (Table 3) for the occurrence of the taxon. 2. This is not connected in the concept of the research work. The taxons were not sampled in the waste dump site and as such their values in the farmland will affect the richness and abundance of micro invertebrates in the sites. 3. The aspect of distribution in different trophic guilds was not considered in this study. 4. This comment is taken care of in Table 3. And it is discussed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	study consider that the soil fauna is "sensitive to changes in the environmental conditions and can be utilized as indicators of soil pollution or other anthropogenic disturbances".	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The Author must separate the words that are together in the text. 2) It is necessary to maintain a pattern in order to facilitate the understanding of the results. Therefore, I suggest first mentioning the results for the waste dumpsite, then reporting those on farm land, following what was done in terms of the percentage contribution of the phyla, in the item "Abstract". 3) The Author cited several references in the text of the present manuscript, but they were not cited in the item "References" (Smith et al., 1996; Papageorgiov, 2006; ISWA, 2015; Kardol et al., 2010; Bengtsson et al., 1998; Eaton et al., 2004; Moldenke & Thies, 1996; Folgarit, 1998; Kaufman, 2005).	5. Done 6. Treated 7. Treated
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		