



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_24590
Title of the Manuscript:	Preliminary survey and ecological studies on diversity of ants fauna in Asir region, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
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	Please make homogeneous the citation of Fig and table in the text. The use of dot, spaces is varying. Some examples: line 128: (Fig. 2). Line 137: (Table.2 & Fig. 2). Line 171: (Table2 and Fig2). Line 169: (Table. 1) Line 174:(Table2). Introduction Line 54: to substitute "their" with "the" Line 57: all the final sentence have to be supported by some references reporting examples of positive and negative effects. Material and Methods Line 64: to substitute "divide" with "divides" Line 65: put a comma after "plateau" Line 67: to substitute "make" with "making" Line 68: put the verb "is" between "which" and "higher" Line 72: substitute "pervious" with "previous" Line 80: substitute "ant" with "ants" Line 84: delete a dot after "(Lattke 2000)." Line 99: not "Shannon wiener", but "Shannon-Wiener"	Ok, Ok, I correct all them. This part, delete because not found this file. Ok,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results and Discussion Line 107: put “sites” after “surveyed” and delete “along” Line 109: not “corelation” but “correlation and not “precipitation”, but “precipitation” Line 111: figure is cut and not completely visible Line 112: the same for the caption Line 113: species names have to be written in italic Line 114 table 3: It should be given a range of values to discriminate among high, medium and low densities LINE 116: (Table 4) What are the results of the ICE? Line 117: is not possible to distinguish the two different elevations, it means that the biodiversity index resulted equal in both? It seems a bit weird. In the second column is reported a SD value, for Shannon or Simpson index? It is related to a mean value calculated on the number of ants collected in the sites of the same elevation? Actually the table reports results only on the base of the sampling methodology. Or the mean is based on a number of traps and hand picking events? Authors should better explain what they done. Line 120 – 127: all species names must be written in Italic Line 123: not “them”, but “the” Line 125: delete “by” Line 128: to substitute “Pitfail” with “pitfall” ok Line 131: all this sentence has to be rewritten Line 132: substitute “represents” with “representing” Line 133: substitute “catch” with “catches” Line 134-136: change the sentence with “Subfamily Formicinae, mainly represented by the genus Camponotus, formed the bulk (19.85%) with Camponotus sericeus the most represented species (78	Here replaced figure to table. Results are depended the numbers of sampling each methodology. 0-20____low 21-50____med 51-100____high Don't understand what mean's this
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	specimens). Again the hand picking method was found to be the most effective followed by pitfall. (It is just a proposal, but it seems more clear to me) Line 138: delete a space after "15.5°C," ok Discussion (another chapter with the word "discussion?" Line 150: If the beginning of the sentence is: "There are.." as in the previous version, I confirm to add "that", but if the new version starts: "Several studies ..." you can delete the word "That". ok Line 150: add "that" after "studies" Line 151: add "one showing" before "a steady" Line 152: delete "or" add "and another" Line 157: add "we" before "categorize" Line 157: how do you use the morphological traits of ants to measure their functional diversity? Where are the results of your measures? Line 163: where did you show the data about a guild proportionality analysis? Why did not you produce a table with them? Line 164: substitute "have" with "previously", delete "earlier that" and substitute with "we" Line 166: add "that" before "found" Line 169: substitute "was" with "were", and "sutable" with "suitable" Line 170: substitute "tempareture" with "temperature" Line 176: it is not possible to have a good view of figure 3 Line 178: substitute "reflects" with "reflected" and "decrease" with "decreasing" Line 180-181: again scientific names in italic Line 180: Where are data about the species richness indices in Fig 2? Line 182: you wrote about differences between the two	Ok, I correct all them. Ok, I correct all them. I answered this in (comment paper)
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	elevation gradients, but table 4 reported only confrontation between the two sampling methods. Conclusion Line 206: dot and not comma after “region” Substitute “reflects” with “reflected” and “ with” by “in” Line 212: add “have been” before “observed” Line 222: to substitute “tht” with “the” ok	Ok, I correct all them. Been here illustrate the richness of species number of samples collected from different regions in two methods were put each of them a different color. Yes, were collected sampling only two methods, and during the collected observed that the high and low of the elevation affects the number of species, that have been explained in a way abbreviate.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Dear authors, I appreciated your effort to improve the manuscript. I seems to me that the English language could be improved, but am not a native english speaker. I have put my new observation by using a yellow background. Authors did not give how many pitfall traps they adopted for each site of collection, it seems just one, but it sounds a bit scarce to describe the community structure of ants. In the results they reported ta list of 13 surveyed areas, but they have to report them in the material and methods chapter. How do they manage the distribution of the pitfall traps in order to cover a sampling area site as best as possible? (how many traps, how much distance among them?). They should use some sentences in describing the transects along where they sampled the ants by hand picking. How did they individuate the transects, how many meters are they , or other useful information to let better understand the experimental approach. I read it as a good attempt to provide useful and original information toward the implementation of the environmental knowledge in a very interesting environmental context. I would say particularly important in a period of world climatic changes, when any habitat, could became a very important reservoir of biodiversity.	I had arranged this chapter depend the basically scientifically. I was took all sampling by two methods and experimental areas I was put the basic information. Two field techniques were used to collect and study ants mainly Pitfall trapping(Four traps for each location according the four geographical directions and the distance between the pitfall traps about 500 m) and direct sampling (Random Hand picking). Add this in the manuscript.