



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_25938
Title of the Manuscript:	An intermetamorphic larval stage of a mantis shrimp and its contribution to the 'missingelement problem' of stomatopod raptorial appendages
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>As you will see from the attached reviews, while the reviewer point out that your paper has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field of the research. I encourage you to consider the review comments carefully in PDF archive in e-mail.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p> <p>The article has a problem, there doubts whether the larvae are the same species for comparison. Maybe of different families, can be natural such differentiations. It is necessary to identify the individuals possibly to family or genus.</p> <p>The study agreed with ethics morphology of Stomatopods . Anesthetized the animals before analysis, and stored them in an appropriate place.</p>	<p>We followed most changes; additionally, we commented on the reviews in a separate letter.</p> <p>We are aware that the two specimens are probably not the same species. However, we still think that these specimens provide important details for our discussion regardless of their conspecificity. In stomatopods, the species affinities of larvae are in most cases not clear. Especially for antizoea larvae, which we describe here, it has not been possible to breed them in the lab. A gross systematic assignment is possible which we also give in the Discussion. We discuss all these aspects in detail at the beginning of the Discussion.</p> <p>The specimens stem from the Dana expedition in the 1920s, so we did not perform any experiments on living animals.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Review abstract, reduce introduction and conclusion and review the references.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract has been amended. - As not all readers will probably be familiar with the topic, we think that the Introduction needs to be in its current length. - We prefer to keep the Conclusion as list, if this is in conformation with the journal style. - References adjusted to journal style.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, the article is well written and presents relevant data. But should be reviewed some comments.	