SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOB_32748**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Body Size Variation in Pterostichus montanus 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**INTRODUCTION** 1. The introduction is on the relationship between latitude and body size. Title is on the relationship between altitude and body size. Latitude and altitude are two different things. Latitude is the relative position on Earth surface measured from the equator. It is measured in degrees. Altitude is the height from sea level. It is measured in feet or meters. Relationships between climate and latitude differs from relationships between climate and altitude. Therefore, I suggest that the "Introduction" be re-written. 2. Introduction is not sufficient. Should provide information on previous studies on relationships between insect body size and other habitat/ geographical variables. Is this the first time that the relationship between insect body size and altitude is studied? If there are previous studies they should be mentioned. **MATERIALS AND METHODS** **Study Sites** 1. Changes have to be done on Fig. 1. 2. Legend of Fig. 1 has to be changed. 3. Corrections have to be done to the text. They are highlighted and indicated on the text itself.	

	Study Organism Changes indicated on text. **Study Design** Should be re-written. Suggestions given on text. **Morphometric Analysis** Changes indicated on text. **RESULTS** Results are not interpreted properly. Environmental parameters are considered without measuring them in the current study. Environmental parameters (climate and soil) should have been measured at each site and subjected to statistical analysis to conclude your results. **DISCUSSION** Highly confusing!! Authors talk about various species that they have not studied here. Discussion is not sufficient. It does not discuss your results properly. **The authors have concluded that there is no relationship between body size and altitude. However, the statistical analysis for this conclusion, number of beetle specimens used for each altitude, results (Table showing average beetle body size parameters for each altitude) are missing. Without these information how can the authors come to this decision ?** **Further, authors conclude that there is a variation in population structure with altitude. The statistical analysis to this part is unclear. Population structure includes the abundance, gender proportions, age/ size proportions. These are not**	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	given. **Authors discuss environmental fluctuations affecting population structure and environmental factors influencing populations. The study does not measure any environmental parameters. Therefore, cannot come to such conclusions.** **REFERENCES** Formatting is completely and not in accordance with journal guidelines. I have indicated some errors on the text itself.	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammatical and other such errors are highlighted and indicated on the text itself.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Chandima D. Dangalle***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Zoology and Environment Sciences, Faculty of Science, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka***