

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_122779
Title of the Manuscript:	Community structure of intertidal macrofauna: spatial autocorrelation of two rocky coasts of Gujarat, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In spite of taxonomic identification at high level, the writers tried to study macrobenthos community for differentiation of two marine coastal area/environments, through autocorrelation technique. But The authors should address the identified shortcomings by reorganizing the paper, providing more detail in the methods, interpreting the results, and improving the overall coherence of the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract should be structured similarly to a scientific paper (intro, methods, results, conclusion and etc.). It should be reworked. The results section is primarily descriptive. Instead, it should focus on the findings of the study and compare them with other work in the field.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The methods section doesn't provide enough detail about the data collection and statistical analysis techniques used. More specifics are needed for clarity.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I recommend that the manuscript undergo major revisions. The manuscript should be resubmitted after these substantial revisions are made. Abstract, Result section, discussion and conclusion should be reworked.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, discussion section should be strengthen by comparing more literatures.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	More comments have been inserted the text. The manuscript should be resubmitted after these substantial revisions are made.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rezvan Mousavi-Nadushan
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran