

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_90549
Title of the Manuscript:	Moths diversity in Barsuan Range, Bonai forest division, Odisha, India and their ecological importance
Type of the 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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The submitted article addresses the diversity of moths in a forest in India.</p> <p>Several details regarding the applied methodology need to be clarified:</p> <p>how many collections were made? Were they monthly? Did all the five sites chosen have the same characteristics? Are they different landscapes?</p> <p>It should be noted that the moth capture-recapture technique was not considered.</p> <p>A major limitation of this version of the article is that it only makes a descriptive comparison between species diversity, since there is no quantitative data for each species. Furthermore, species similarity between different works is not analyzed, much less the comparison among different environments and their possible effects on entomofauna.</p> <p>In Table 1, invert the two columns and put all the species of the same family together, without the need to repeat the names of the families. Replace "Zygaenoidea" by "Zygaenidae".</p> <p>The first lines of the conclusions are very general and can be drawn.</p> <p>Still in the Conclusions, two months of collection were highlighted, although no mention was made of monthly collections before, nor their results were made available.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In general, it is well written, except for some parts that need to be revised.</p> <p>Some punctual corrections are needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - on line 4 (Introduction): replace "are reported" by "reported"; on penultimate line: Moths..., and they.. (not to repeat the same word); - rewrite "This in particular since there are indications that moth diversity may accurately reflect conservation values" and "bio-wealth of the range" - Put a period at the end of all "et al" - In the Results and Discussion, line 4: which pest species are important? Reference(s)? <i>Lymantria mathura</i> and not <i>Mathura</i>; 	
Optional/General comments	<p>fter all these corrections, the work can be re-evaluated for publication.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Claudio José Von Zuben
Department, University & Country	São Paulo State University, Brazil