

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_116377
Title of the Manuscript:	PRELIMINARY STUDY OF INSECTS COLONIZING DECOMPOSING DOMESTIC PIGLETS (<i>Sus domesticus</i> ERXLEBEN) CARCASSES AT UMUDIKE, SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA
Type of the 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:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>♣ The study of insect succession on decomposing carcasses provides valuable information for forensic investigations, especially when determining post-mortem intervals (PMIs) longer than a few months or years. The investigation involved pig carcasses exposed in two seasons, documenting the carrion entomofauna during the first and last phases after death. Based on the composition of the insect fauna found on a cadaver, it might be possible to estimate the year and season of death.</p> <p>♣ This knowledge could prove invaluable in forensic investigations, especially when dealing with older cases.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Not suitable</p> <p>♣ Alternate title for the study is mentioned below: "Insect Succession and Decomposition Dynamics on Decomposing Domestic Piglet (<i>Sus domesticus</i> ERXLEBEN) Carcasses in Umudike, Southeastern Nigeria"</p> <p>♣ A big NO The abstract needs to be rewritten since it has no objective clearly mentioned and only the results have been written nor the discussion, conclusion and the outcome of the work is discussed.</p> <p>♣ The sections, subsections and the structure of the manuscript needs to be strictly rewritten.</p> <p>♣ To the best of my knowledge this can be treated as a short communication for publication in your Journal rather than considering it as an entire original Research article since, the work is just a replica of the previous works and is not quite impressive to be published in your esteemed journal. The number of animals considered for the experimentation and the seasons selected, methodology employed feels like just a graduate project work. There is no detailed information on the methodology employed, no images of the experimentation, incomplete tables, no graphical representations, lack of references cited.</p> <p>♣ The references mentioned are very old. References need to be upgraded and cited correctly. There are lots a works done and published in reputed journals regarding the same in recent years which could be considered and referred. Overall, the entire manuscript needs to be rewritten.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>♣ Again a big NO</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>♣ The preparation of the manuscript is a big diaster in this case.</p> <p>♣ Introdcution regarding Forensic science is mentioned but the importance microfauna in the process of decomposition is lacking.</p> <p>♣ Only four piglets were selected for the entire study which is imposiible to get the correct statistics.</p> <p>♣ Only two seasons and two methods were selected but it would have been more impressive if other methodologies would have been utilised by burring under the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>ground, placing the animal carcasse above the ground with arthropods and without arthropods etc....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">♣ The result section should be completely rewritten. There is no mentioning of the indicator and dominant species of arthropods.♣ In the discussion they have mentioned five decomposition stages, what were the indications to identify the stages of decomposition?♣ In the conclusion part it is mentioned that Hung piglet carcasses took longer time to skeletonize when compared to the ground-placed what is the reason for this is to be clearly written.♣ References need to be written correctly. Most of the references are not included in the test and reference section. The author is advised to use specific format for citing the references.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sneha Suma Hegde
Department, University & Country	Vijayanagara Sri Krishnadevaraya University, India