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### Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Compulsory</strong> REVISION comments</th>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>Author's feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Is the manuscript important for scientific community?  &lt;br&gt; (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</td>
<td>Yes, the studies of population or of communities censuses they are always important, because they constitute the base of the knowledge for future studies in a certain area.</td>
<td>Yes, it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Is the title of the article suitable?  &lt;br&gt; (If not please suggest an alternative title)</td>
<td>Yes, it is comprehensive and clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</td>
<td>Yes, they follow the appropriate structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</td>
<td>It is correct, but I consider they should fix some details for their publication, with a view to maintaining the quality of the journal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</td>
<td>Yes, it is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Are the references sufficient</td>
<td>Yes, it is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and recent? If you have
suggestion of additional
references, please mention in
the review form.

(Apart from above mentioned 6
points, reviewers are free to
provide additional
suggestions/comments)

I consider that the writing should be revised. The
technical language in several cases is not the
appropriate one and colloquial sentences exist, etc.
Also, although it is a simple study of census of an
animal group, some statistical basic analysis
should be included, as the one they must be
calculate of indexes of diversity, to grant more
force to the results. I also consider that they could
deepen more in the discussion with regard to the
distribution or threat grade or endemisms that have
the opposing species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor REVISION comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The table I should include basic information in a
census study, as the endemisms, the national
distribution and the grade of threat of the opposing
species. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The graph that appears in the manuscript is not
enunciated in the text of the same one. This should
get ready, since when enunciating as much the
tables as the graphics, it is guided the reader in a
logical order of the information. |
### Reviewer's comment

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?

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

### 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)
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