



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_43918
Title of the Manuscript:	The full hierarchical structuration of species abundances reliably inferred from the numerical extrapolation of still partial samplings: a case study with marine snail communities in Mannar Gulf (India)
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>)

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	- manuscript excessively long to be consider as an original research paper: 10941 word instead of 6000 maximum - 28 figures and 5 tables instead of 15 figures and / tables as in the guide to authors; - Abstract does not follow the guide authors to ScienceDomain International: Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion - The tables are incomplete, with titles too long, footnotes are absents and make them incomprehensible - Reduce the number of figures by grouping them (See comment in the manuscript - - the interpretation of figures or tables must be presented before these - Delete the references in conclusion. This is not the discussion. - The conclusion must be the answer to your specific objective	• Thanks for the review *at first, I agree with the remark (see Tio- A2, lines 71-82) that the specific goals of the study deserve more precisions, at the end of the Introduction. Accordingly, I have added a § (underlined in yellow) at lines 85 to 102, which provides more details in this respect *The length of the manuscript is function of the scope and interest of the subject. I agree that this paper is rather rich and extensive, according to these reasons. Yet, neither the number of Figures nor the number of Tables can be reduced without impairing the correct understanding of results and the subsequent discussion. *As concerns the Abstract, the template you mention is one among other possible approaches that are equally accepted by the Publisher. Moreover, here, some point of the suggested template would not fit at all the nature of the reported work, which involve the analyses of <i>already reported</i> results so that, for example, "place and duration of study" is not a point to be relevantly consider in the Abstract. *Tables incomplete (what is missing ?), yet titles too long: would reducing the length of tables legend makes them more easy to be understood? *Grouping the Figures, as suggested would simply makes them confuse and, accordingly, would in no way improve the paper *The detailed interpretation of results is usually one on the main object of the "Discussion" section which always follows (and not precede) the section "Results" within which Figures and Tables are presented. *I do agree that, usually, no bibliographic references should occur in the Conclusion. There is, yet, an exception to this. That is when, in addition to answering to the specific objective of the study, a possible <i>future enlargement</i> of the study is evoked, in the context of other reported results. This is the case here, so that mention of the references to these other



SDI Review Form 1.6

		reported results are necessary at the time they are evoked, i.e. in the Conclusion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	