

directly behind the most extensive mangroves. The above said resilient mangroves were extremely damaged by speed hit of *Thane* cyclone and damaged properties of the coastal people. Some 168 ha of mangrove habitat was present before the cyclone and approximately 70 ha (41.6%) was damaged by it (Figure 2). Over half of the salt marsh habitats (51%) was removed by the cyclone. Moreover, it is an invaluable loss and would take years to bring back the green cover. The ability of mangroves to reduce damage caused by tsunamis and topical storms is reportedly one of the most undervalued ecosystem services provided by such forests⁴, but evidence supporting this claim is controversial. Studies were conducted after the Indian Ocean tsunami of December 2004, which revealed that mangroves acted as bioshields, and villages located behind them suffered lesser damage than those directly exposed to the coast^{5,6}. On the other hand, reanalysis of data from different areas found no significant relationship between human mortality and the extent of mangrove forest fronting coastal hamlets⁷⁻⁹.

Coastal vegetation, such as mangroves, can provide coastal communities with

many valuable goods and services, and the protection and rehabilitation of these ecosystems is essential. Furthermore, the cost of mangrove restoration is relatively high and its effectiveness as a barrier against cyclones appears to be less when compared to the early warning systems. Conservation of mangrove forests is reported to prevent occupation of low-lying areas which are close to the coast¹⁰. However, in the absence of sufficient studies, the role of mangrove vegetation in protecting the coastal communities against strong storms remains an open question.

1. Satheeshkumar, P., *Iran. Fish Sci.*, 2012, **11**, 184–203.
2. McBride, J. L., Report, WMO/TD-No. 693, No. TCP-38, WMO, Geneva, 1995, pp. 65–103.
3. Satheeshkumar, P., Khan, A. B. and Kumar, D. S., *Res. Earth Sci.*, 2010, **2**, 14–16.
4. Barbier, E. B. *et al.*, *Science*, 2008, **319**, 321–323.
5. Danielsen, F. *et al.*, *Science*, 2005, **310**, 643.
6. Kathiresan, K. and Rajendran, N., *Estuarine Coastal Shelf Sci.*, 2005, **65**, 601–606.

7. Kerr, A. M., Baird, A. H. and Campbell, S. J., *Estuarine Coastal Shelf Sci.*, 2006, **67**, 539–541.
8. Baird, A. H., Bhalla, R. S., Kerr, A. M., Pelkey, N. and Srinivas, V., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 2009, **106**, E111.
9. Das, S. and Vincent, J. R., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 2009, **106**, 7357–7360.
10. Fegin, R. A., Bernard, S. M. L., Ravens, T. M., Möller, I., Yeager, K. M. and Baird, A. H., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 2009, **106**, 10109–10113.

P. SATHEESHKUMAR^{1,*}
R. SIVA SANKAR²
D. SENTHIL KUMAR³
A. ATHITHAN²

¹Central Marine Fisheries Research
Institute,
Kochi 682 018, India

²Department of Ecology and
Environmental Sciences,
Pondicherry University,
Puducherry 605 014, India

³Kandaswamy Kandara Arts and Science
College,

Paramathi-Velur 638 181, India

*e-mail: indianscientsathish@gmail.com

The art of reviewing – the Indian context

Most scientific journals, with or without an impact factor, obtain reviews on the contributions and for a fair process these are from two or more reviewers. Reviewing is an honorary task and entails time, patience, aptitude and love for the subject. Reviewing is a delicate art and besides the above prerequisites, a reviewer also has to offer suggestions and opinions in a better, understandable and diplomatic way. Some reviewers (both Indian and foreign) have a general way to comment and offer sweeping statements, e.g. the language is poor or grammar is bad. The native English reviewers' attitude would be condescending and they would mention that 'it is understandable that the authors are non-native English speakers and should seek help from a native English speaker or some professional'. Such comments from native English speakers are (sometimes) acceptable, but may be unacceptable and even laughable if offered by non-native English reviewers including Indians. There would be instances when the English of such re-

viewers itself leaves much to be desired. Some Indian reviewers have a brusque style and without offering any helpful suggestions tend to rip the manuscript with vague remarks. To cover their reviewing deficiency they tend to nitpick for no apparent reasons. For example, there would be a comment that the references are not according to the format even if this is not true. An irksome habit of certain Indian reviewers is to use rude language in their report, while there are others who keep the manuscript for months and later reject it without even reviewing. These attitudes are perhaps because the reviewer is either a competitor or a grudge-bearing colleague of the author.

Some reviewers take months, if not years, to pass on their report and such a delay may make redundant the presented data and observations. Although reviewing is a thankless and time-consuming task, but the reviewer, being considered as an expert in the field and having accepted the responsibility, should do

justice not only to an author but also to the time and energy spent in reviewing. To an author, addressing and replying to a reviewer's comments should be an intellectually stimulating exercise rather than an unpleasant task that has to be got over with at the earliest.

The editorial team has a significant role in the selection of a reviewer. If it noticed that certain reviewers are time and again tardy in submitting the report and/or the language is bordering on the abusive, then such reviewers should be informed and if required be shunned from the future review process, as there is no dearth of good and enthusiastic reviewers. Let not the reviewer forget that he/she is also an author sometimes and has to go through similar trails and tribulations.

SRIDHAR D. IYER

Chamunda Residency, Caranzalem,
Goa 403 002, India
e-mail: sdiyer2001@rediffmail.com