

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121697
Title of the Manuscript:	Butterfly Diversity Of Navsari Agricultural University (Nau), Navsari, Gujarat, India
Type of the Article	Original 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it contributes to the understanding of butterfly diversity in a specific region of Gujarat, an area that has not been extensively studied. The detailed analysis and data presented are valuable for researchers interested in biodiversity and conservation. However, the manuscript could be improved by incorporating a broader context and discussing potential implications for local biodiversity conservation efforts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable and clearly reflects the content of the manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is generally comprehensive but could benefit from a clearer summary of the main findings and their implications. It would be helpful to explicitly mention key results and their significance.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized, making it easy to follow.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodology is appropriate, and the data analysis is thorough. The findings offer valuable insights into butterfly diversity at the study site. The study employs suitable statistical methods and presents the results clearly, making a significant contribution to the field. However, the manuscript would benefit from a more extensive discussion on the implications of the findings for local conservation efforts. Additionally, the introduction could be improved by including a more detailed review of similar studies conducted in Gujarat or neighboring regions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are generally sufficient but could be updated with more recent studies on butterfly diversity and conservation in India. It would be beneficial to include recent publications to provide a more current context.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable, but minor grammatical and typographical errors should be corrected to enhance clarity and professionalism.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript would benefit from additional contextual information and a more detailed discussion on the implications of the findings for conservation efforts.	

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 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Harsh Vishwakarma
Department, University & Country	Government Holkar Science College, Devi Ahilya University, India