Dear Dr Hendrickx,

The enclosed paper, "Reproductive costs of Hydractinia symbiolongicarpus (Buss and Yund) to its host hermit crab Pagurus longicarpus (Say)" by Christine Damiani, has been submitted for consideration for publication in the Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. I would be grateful if you could referee it for me, to recommend for or against its publication and to indicate what modifications would improve it. A response within 4 WEEKS of receipt would be most helpful. Thank you.

In your review, could you please pay particular attention to the following issues:

1. Is the paper on a topic relevant to the scope of the Journal and of interest to its readers?
2. Is the paper written clearly, concisely and economically - particularly with regard to numbers of Figures and Tables?
3. Has adequate attention been paid to the relevant literature? It is an increasing trend for papers to demonstrate lack of regard for relevant previous studies.
4. Is there a clear, explicit and orderly structure that demonstrates the nature of the experimental (hypothesis-testing) content of the contribution? In particular, are the following clear:
   (i) the scope, generality or specificity, etc., of the ecological observations and system being investigated;
   (ii) the nature of the models, theories, explanations, concepts being investigated;
   (iii) the hypotheses (predictions) being examined and how these relate to the patterns, processes and theories being investigated;
   (iv) the designs of the experimental components of the study and how these will produce unambiguous information;
   (v) the assumptions underlying any statistical procedures or their interpretations. In particular, where assumptions are unlikely to be true, is there a realistic account of any consequences for the interpretation of results;
   (vi) the relevance, "completeness" and consistency of the discussion, including consideration of implications of results for other researchers in different sub-fields (habitats, organisms, etc.).

5. Because of Elsevier’s electronic delivery of abstracts, keywords are now more important than ever. Please comment on or suggest better keywords.

Please provide your recommendation on the enclosed form, but use any ancillary presentation that suits you. Fax the form or send your review via email if you would prefer and there are no substantial comments directly on the manuscript. Otherwise, please return those pages on which you have written comments.

Email for return is mbotton@bio.usyd.edu.au.

Thank you for your help in making this journal more consistent in the quality of its contents. Please contact me if you need more helpful information.

Yours sincerely

A.J. Underwood
Professor of Experimental Ecology