



**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 <i>P. montanus</i>"? 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>1. Cited study in these lines is number 9: Ananina, T. L. (2010) Ground Beetles number dynamics in mountains of north – east Baikal region. Buryat (not [8] Abalakov, Molozshnikov).</p> <p>2. Climate conditions at the lake coast and high altitudes are similar, no problem with that. But they can not be a factor. Just "climate conditions" can, temperature and hydrothermal coefficient too (as you cite in the end of the passage 160 – 166). You must be more correct in defining the main factor. Clear the phrase.</p> <p>Maybe you should precise the term by using "size structure of the population".</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. This doesn't answer the question.</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</p>	<p>The transect was 30-km long and was directed to high altitudes So, let it be clear in the text. Revised OK, but you might keep the old map in the corner of this new</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>the transect was long 30 km, why is the “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>graph. It gives an impression about the actual topography.</p> <p>It sill repeats.</p> <p>Besides, you should add the latin names of the plants in the text.</p> <p>All statistical parameters are presented</p> <p>That is correct, but they show almost nothing except some homogeneity of the data...</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>You’ve added a note about it in the Introduction, but it is still not clear where the <i>C. odoratus</i> appears from in the Discussion. We see the number 14 (cited paper), but it would be better if you specify that “the dominant species” is <i>C. odoratus</i> (if that is the case). It needs just 2 words, as you’ll see in the MS.</p>
<b>Optional/General</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> <p>Impressive!</p>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Teodora Teofilova</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Animal Diversity and Resources, Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research (IBER), Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria</b>