

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	Research 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes (But on different sections different style was used so it is prescribed that all reference in both the text as well as in reference section should be in same format)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author/s mentioned the details of species in text with full details that increase the length of manuscript. Such information regarding the species morphological characteristics already known to the scientific community and author also provide such details in the table too. So if possible authors can remove the text details and merge the tables as master one for all morphological parameters. That might be helpful for the readers to understand the comparative morphological scenario of the available species.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. (In Manuscript different sections exhibited different styles of references, so it is prescribed that all references in both the text as well as in the reference section should be in the same format)</p> <p>2. The author/s mentioned the details of species in text with full details that increase the length of manuscript. Such information regarding the species morphological characteristics already known to the scientific community and author also provide such details in the table too. So if possible authors can remove the text details and merge the tables as master one for all morphological parameters. That might be helpful for the readers to understand the comparative morphological scenario of the available species.</p> <p>3. Author should provide the details of the repository where the specimens were submitted and accession or specimen numbers were allotted.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vivek Sharma
Department, University & Country	Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati University, India