



**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	<b>Line 5</b>	Small capitals - ground beetles	<b>Revised</b>
	<b>Line 13</b>	Small capitals - ground beetles	<b>Revised</b>
	<b>Line 17</b>	Delete full stop after INTRODUCTION	<b>Author – Motch.</b>
	<b>Line 41</b>	When latin name of the species is mentioned for the first time it shall be accompanied with the name of author.	<b>Revised</b>
	<b>Line 78-84</b>	Paragraph from lines 78 - 84 needs alignment justified	
	<b>Line 140-146</b>	Paragraph from lines 140 -146 needs alignment justified	
	<b>Line 62</b>	I would suggest to put the legend in the description of the Figure 1 and to use more accurate description of prevailing vegetation at each area (Red-bilbery wood, pine-tree, Bilbery-wood, cedar etc.). I would also suggest changing cyrillic inscriptions on the figure to latinic letters.	<b>Revised</b>
	<b>Line 69-70</b>	When latin name of the species is mentioned for the first time it shall be accompanied with the name of author.	<b>Revised</b>
	<b>Line 76</b>	Small capitals - ground beetles	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<b>Line 94</b>	<p>This sentence should be moved to results and revised.</p> <p>It would be useful to write how many samples were collected in total, how the determination of specie <i>P. montanus</i> was done (keys are missing).</p> <p><i>For example like this:</i>  <i>In total, xx ground beetles were collected from all 7 (xx?) sample sites during the period of xx years. Determination of P. montanus was done according to the xx. 1200 specimens of P. montanus were measured in order to distinguish differences among populations at different altitudes. Their body size did not differ at different altitudes while means of the six studied traits and their standard deviation were approximately equal...</i></p> <p>It is not clear what do authors mean by 8 local populations. According to the Figure 1. and description, authors mentioned 7 sample sites (so the reader would assume 7 different populations as well).</p>	<b>Revised</b>
	<b>Line 104</b>	<p>Delete "But", you can't start the sentence with the conjunction.</p> <p>Delete repeated word "fig." <b>Revised</b></p>	
	<b>Line 129-133</b>	<p>This section should be moved to conclusions.</p> <p><b>REVISED</b></p>	
	<b>Line 151-152</b>	<p>Adjust table according to the guidelines, columns are fractured so the number are not easy to read or compare.</p> <p>p&lt;0,0000?</p> <p>Adjust the number of decimal places to be the same in all numbers. <b>REVISED</b></p>	
	<b>Line 157</b>	<p>Which both species? According to the manuscript authors analyzed only <i>P. montanus</i>.</p> <p><b>In this MS we study only <i>P. montanus</i>, another</b></p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>one had been studied earlier and we mentioned that publication in References Sukhodolskaya, R. A., Ananina T. L. (2014) Morphometric variation in <i>Carabus odoratus barguzinicus</i> Shil, 1996 (Carabidae, Coleoptera) in elevation gradient. In: Ivanov, D. V., Ed., Scientific Studies Book of the Institute of Ecology, Kazan, 46 – 57. It is mentioned in References</p>	
--	--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<b>Line 160-161</b>	<p>Specie <i>C. odoratus</i> in not mentioned anywhere in paper neither in results. Discriminant analysis (Fig. 7.) only referrers to the populations of <i>P. montanus</i>.</p> <p>In this MS we study only <i>P. montanus</i>, another one had been studien earlier and we mentioned that publication in References See above</p> <p>It is not clear here do authors make conclusions from own experiment or comparing results on <i>P. montanus</i> with previous researches on <i>C. odoratus</i> from other authors. If yes, some reference is necessary. If not, I suggest to include additional results on <i>C. odoratus</i> or to exclude this allegation from manuscript and only discuss on results regarding to <i>P. montanus</i>.</p> <p>In discussion we compare <i>P. montanus</i> results with results in <i>C. odoratus</i>. We studied <i>C. odoratus</i> in the same habitats also and corresponding publication is mentioned in references.</p> <p>Also, when latin name of the species is mentioned for the first time it shall be accompanied with the name of author. <b>REVISED</b></p>	
	<b>Line 163</b>	<p>In line 94 authors wrote that 8 local populations were measured. My previous comment (line 67) referrers to your 7 sample sites. Here authors are writing that only 4 populations were under study. This is very confusing for the reader.</p> <p>Authors should define better sample sites - mark them on the figure 1. and define the populations included in the study. Avoid writing on such inconsistent way. <b>Revised</b></p>	
	<b>Line 169</b>	small capitals - ground beetles <b>REVISED</b>	
	<b>Line 174</b>	This should be moved to the materials and methods and explained better. <b>Here we only</b>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

		noted that we had not done genetic analysis in P. montanus.	
--	--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<b>Line 187</b>	Correct References according to the General Guideline for Authors! <b>Revised</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Line 21-22</b>	Consider revising - the meaning of the sentence is not clear. <i>Did authors meant: "Researchers mostly study such changes on the community level but not paying attention to the physiological variation of morphometric traits".</i>	<b>We meant that body size deviation are studied in communities (small species, large species etc.) and researchers pay much less attention on intraspecific body size variation in carabids.</b>  <b>REVISED</b> <b>REVISED</b>  <b>REVISED</b>   <b>Revised</b>
	<b>Line 27</b>	Delete unnecessarily conjunction "and in"	
	<b>Line 47</b>	Delete unnecessary haypen "-"	
	<b>Line 64</b>	Consider revising: instead of "It was situated.." use "The study was situated.."	
	<b>Line 67</b>	Consider revising - the sentence is not clear. Were beetles sampled at one plot which is adjacent to the lake or beetles were sampled at the plot and other sample site which is adjacent to the lake?  Also, it is not clear were the beetles sampled at each of 7 sampled sites marked on the figure or only on two that you mentioned in the text?	
	<b>Line 66</b>	Delete unnecessary haypen "-" before 1700 m.	
	<b>Line 166</b>	Delete unnecessary haypen "-" after Baikal Lake.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Line 86</b>	I would suggest to add more detailed description of pitfall traps - do they have funnel, roof.. <b>Revised</b>	
	<b>Line 89</b>	Does this statement refers to the whole period of 22 years, between 1988 - 2010? If yeas, leave it as it is, if not please be more specific stating the exact years of sampling.	
	<b>Line 141</b>	I would suggest indicating factors (on the figure or in the legend). <b>In PCA factors are not indicated, they are hypothetical and are ordered by researcher (See, Wikipedia)</b>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<b>Line 173</b>	<p>From this sentence it seems that authors are writing in present state and that research was oriented to <i>Carabus tosanus</i> which I don't believe is the case here since all results are focused on <i>P. montanus</i>.</p> <p>I would suggest to remove this sentence since is not relevant for this study. We can not agree with the respected reviewer because in that publication genetic differences between different altitude populations of carabids were shown. We pursue similar goal.</p>	
--	-----------------	--	--