

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_86099
Title of the Manuscript:	A universal key to rationally select, among the series of nonparametric estimators of species richness, which one performs best, according to the incomplete sampling involved
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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy> )

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Though, this work delves more on the publication of Ulrich Brose <i>et. al.</i> , 2003, titled "Estimating Species Richness: Sensitivity to Sample Coverage and Insensitivity to Spatial Patterns", nonetheless, it polishes the theoretical and statistical vertices of the research. Hence, giving the work a more in-depth exposition.	<b>Thanks for the review</b>  Of course, I agree
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Accept with minor correction	I consider a good part of the suggestions provided along the commented copy Sot A of the original manuscript, including modification of the title in a way which seems to me being better appropriate (corrections <b>underlined in yellow</b> in the revised manuscript)
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A fantastic use of the English Language.	?

### **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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	