

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_78257
Title of the Manuscript:	Report on death of Dwarf Sperm Whale, Kogia sima (Order: Cetacea: Family: Kogiidae) in Vedalai shore of Mandapam, Gulf of Mannar
Type of the Article	Short communication

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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The science included in this manuscript is simple and basic—just description of the dead whale's body. I see no problems with the science, but the language/writing could be improved greatly. One concern is that the writing is awkward and includes basic grammatical mistakes. The author or editor should edit this manuscript to ensure it includes proper English. Some words in the text, Table 1, or Figure 1 caption, are capitalized but in other places the same or equivalent words are not capitalized. Why are some of the words in the heading for the table capitalized but not all? Why is the word "jaw" capitalized in one line of the Table but not the previous line? Why are Ventral and Dorsal capitalized in the figure caption, but not Lateral, etc.? Be consistent! A sentence near the end of page 2 ends with "which"—this seems to be unfinished. Many other sentences appear to have missing words. This does not necessarily affect the science, except that it makes the paper much harder to read, which hinders transfer of scientific information to readers. Some words are misspelled (for example, carcass).</p> <p>I strongly recommend that someone with much experience writing in English</p> <p>A bigger problem—which relates to the science—involves many of the terms that are used, which are not scientific. The author(s) should refer to the animal's thorax, not its chest. The young whale is a neonate, not an infant. The first sentence of the Abstract's Conclusion mentions a sperm whale, but must make clear it is a dwarf sperm whale (very different from a sperm whale!) The end of the Abstract mentions a "beautiful animal." I agree that this species is notable and worth saving, but the word "beautiful" does not belong in a scientific description.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The measurements in the table and photographs in the figure are good. The level of description in the manuscript (for example, the umbilical scar) or the interpretation (trauma to the body from being hit) are good. Do the authors think the "hard hit" was a cause of death, or did it likely occur after death (post mortem)?</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>I like this manuscript, but it needs careful editing.</p>	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alexander J. Werth
Department, University & Country	Hampden-Sydney College, USA