



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_32748
Title of the Manuscript:	Body Size Variation in <i>Pterostichus montanus</i> Motch. (Coleoptera, Carabidae) in Altitudinal Gradient
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The language needs some revision.</p> <p>The second factor (altitude gradient) is precise, but you need to be more specific about the first one. "Climatic conditions of the shore and high altitudes" does not sound reliable. It might be temperature, humidity, vegetation, etc. If you mean that the first gradient in your study is the transition from lowland to high mountain climate, you should specify this. But this not the case, since there is no such gradient pattern on the ordination graph (fig. 6). Indeed, there is a similarity between the coast and the high-mountain plot, but you must be more correct in defining the main factor.</p> <p>It is not clear what do you mean by "population structure". This characteristic of the populations might comprise the age, sex or genetic structure and the spatial distribution.</p> <p>If the "Body size did not differ in the populations at different altitudes", then how "multivariate analysis revealed differences between populations of P. montanus"? Please, explain.</p>	<p>In our MS (160-166 lines) we noted the paper, where the authors considered climate conditions at the lake coast and high altitudes to be similar Abalakov, A. D., Molozshnikov, V. N. (2011) False subglacial ecosystems – endemics, natural phenomena and environmental indicators of Baikal hollow. Proceedings of All-Russia scientific conference, Ulan-Ude, 3-7.</p> <p>In our MS we concerned the only PCA and discriminant analysis results, because other parameters were published earlier Ananina, T. L. (2010) Long-term number dynamics of <i>Pterostichus montanus</i> Motch. (Coleoptera, Carabidae) at the transect of Barguzin mountain. Proceedings of Regional symposium of Siberian and Far East entomologists, Novosibirsk, 7-9. It revealed differences in relationship between traits studied, e. g. different variation etc.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Technical and experimental methods and statistical treatment are adequate, but interpretation suffers from important omissions.</p> <p>"sampled in 30 -km high-altitude transect" – if this means that the transect was long 30 km, why is the</p>	<p>The transect was 30-km long and was directed to high altitudes</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>“high-altitude” for?</p> <p>There are some untranslated labels on the map. It would be more perspicuous if you remove or translate them. Besides, it is not clear what the numbered (1 to 10) squares are for?</p> <p>The legend after the map includes data, partly repeating in the main text below (line 70 – 73). You might consider uniting this information in a Table.</p> <p>Figure 7 is not very informative.</p> <p>In the Discussion section: it is not quite clear where the <i>C. odoratus</i> appears from. Cite this passage more correctly, i.g. mention the author whose work you compare with.</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>All statistical parameters are presented</p> <p>Revised Sukhodolskaya R. A, Ananina T. L. 2015. Altitudinal variation in population density, body size and morphometric structure in <i>Carabus odoratus</i> Shil, 1996 (Coleoptera: Carabidae). <i>Acta Biol. Univ. Daugavp.</i>, 15 (1): 179 – 190.</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>This article presents an interesting dataset which is a valuable contribution to the ground beetle fauna.</p> <p>Did you operate the traps every two weeks during the whole period 1988 – 2010?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>