



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 AJEA 2718
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity and Community Structure of Benthic Insects in Fish Farm Ponds in Southern Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In general, the authors need to work on grammar and word usage. My advice is to request that a colleague of theirs with strong English language skills strongly edit the manuscript. I've made a few comments, but not consistently, as it was my objective to point out the kinds of mistakes, but not all of them. It is the job of the authors to do that. Several statements in the introduction beg for citations, including the first sentence of second paragraph. You cannot state that fish farm ponds are important hotspots without citing the relevant literature that supports the statement. Also in the introduction, second paragraph was somewhat redundant. The same idea that not much work has been done on fish farm pond diversity was expressed in several ways. See comments. There was no broader context in the introduction, that is, relating fish farm pond communities studied outside of Ivory Coast to the general problem that the investigators are studying. There must be some relevant studies so that the current study is not so limited in scope and generalization. In the methods, authors should outline procedure first, and then measurement of environmental variables, so the reader understands what "sampling date" means and	Ok, we cited the relevant literature that supports the statement. Ok we corrected it Ok, we put sampling procedure in first position



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the entire sampling scheme. It was unclear how many sampling dates there were, and whether samples were taken of environmental variables on same dates as macroinvertebrate samples, and whether all farms were sampled the same day or week or what. In addition, if I did the math correctly in my interpretation of samples, there were six samples from each pond, which is $6 \times 3 = 18$ per fish farm. That's $18 \times 5 = 90$ macroinvertebrate samples per month, which is $90 \times 12 = 1,080$ total samples. Is that correct? Explain why the six samples were pooled. Statistical analysis: More explanation is needed of why you used two measures of diversity and two measures of community similarity. The latter needs to be clarified – this is between ponds or between fish farms? That is not clear. Nor is the explanation of ANOVA, which I think may actually be incorrect; if you used time as a factor, you probably need to use some kind of repeated measures ANOVA design. If values are not significantly different from one another, such as diversity indices, you cannot state that one is higher than the other. If the test reveals they are not different, then they are not different. Statements regarding diversity indices in results need to be modified to take this into account.	and mesure of environmental variables in second position Yes Samples were pooled to form one sample per pond Simpson index and Renkonen similarity index were cuted Ok, we corrected this part
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In graphs, label the panels a, b, c, etc. and include a more complete legend as to what is being shown. On line 322, authors make a statement about spatial variation. Where is this shown? These data are not shown, so you can't really make any statement about "spatial variation" in insect abundances. What you mean is that Layo has a much different insect community than the other sites. This may or may not have anything to do with where it is relative to the other sites. If I misread, please clarify the statement. Some other statements about conclusions are not clear, and are indicated in the comments embedded in the PDF; please read those and fix as appropriate. Some statements were too general: "certain species" for instance. Which species?	Ok we did it Ok, we cuted "spatial" The species are Corrected <i>Macroplea</i> sp., <i>Valleriola</i> sp. and Corydalidae, we corrected it in the text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, an interesting study, and should be published, but needs a lot of revision before it is acceptable.	Ok