

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_104920
Title of the Manuscript:	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF ANURAN DIVERSITY, ABUNDANCE, AND DISTRIBUTION IN KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN
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.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the ms presents confirmation and new data for the region studied. It provides valuable zoogeographical information that can be used by future researchers.</p> <p>Title is ok, but I suggest to take the "Quantitative analysis" part out. Please see the reviewed ms document for details.</p> <p>Yes, Abstract OK.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, nice ensemble of historical and recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. Very minor issues have been addressed in the reviewed ms document.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All details are in the reviewed ms document. Nice job, although mostly qualitative. This ms could provide background information for future researchers.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paola Lombardo
Department, University & Country	Italy