

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_100254
Title of the Manuscript:	Brief note on hooded grasshopper Teratodes monticollis (Gray, 1832) and intraspecific colour variation from Bonai forest division, Odisha, India
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>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, this manuscript followed all scientific values so it is useful for the future research also. Already research going on it. So, it is acceptable work 2. yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. yes 6. If possible, please add recent updated references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	I applaud the authors for taking the effort to conduct this study and for their hard work. There are a few small adjustments and edits that need to be made to the document. I recommend to be minor revisions.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Davella
Department, University & Country	Kakatiya University, India