

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_120747
Title of the Manuscript:	First new Record of albino Common Kukri Snake (<i>Oligodon arnensis</i>) (Shaw, 1802) from Uttarakhand, India
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it documents the new record of an albino Common Kukri Snake (<i>Oligodon arnensis</i>) in Uttarakhand, India. Such findings are rare and provide valuable insights into the biodiversity and distribution patterns of reptiles in the region.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the focus of the manuscript. However, for clarity, it could be slightly revised to emphasize that it is a record of albinism. Suggested title: "First Record of Albino Common Kukri Snake (<i>Oligodon arnensis</i>) (Shaw, 1802) in Uttarakhand, India."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and well-written. It effectively highlights the significance of the discovery.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. adding the geographical coordinates and habitat details of the discovery site could enhance its informativeness.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The discovery of a rare albino variant of <i>Oligodon arnensis</i> is well-documented, and the findings are presented in a clear and logical manner.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are sufficient. They provide a solid foundation for the study and include relevant and up-to-date sources. However, it would be beneficial to include additional references that specifically address the distribution and conservation status of reptiles in India.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written, clear, and free of significant grammatical errors.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1.The keywords should be revised to avoid repetition of words from the title. Suggested keywords: Colubridae, Squamata, biodiversity, herpetofauna.</p> <p>2. It would be helpful to include basic taxonomic characteristics of the species in its natural state and measurements other than length. This would provide a more comprehensive description of the species.</p> <p>3. Including the geographical coordinates, height above sea level, and habitat details of the discovery site would add valuable context to the findings.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Hassan Mhanna
Department, University & Country	Shivaji University, India