

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses the butterfly richness in the Navsari Agricultural University (NAU), which is a University located near the western coast of Indian peninsula in Navsari districts of the southern Gujarat region at the northern tip of the Western Ghats. The surveys were conducted between 2020-2022. The article in itself presents more or less only the species list of the butterflies observed during the two full seasons of observations (with their photographs) but somehow fails to place the number of species found in true context, or to mention the significance of such findings. 83 species should be considered quite few, as the authors mention 334 species found in Western Ghats as a whole, which would consequently represent less than 25% of the species in the entire region. The appropriate host plants species for the most important butterflies are also not mentioned, as the author mentions only that the region is green and full of plants. That is way too vague. The host plants for the most important butterfly species should thus be identified and mentioned by name in the text, while their approximate abundance should also be given. Also, the description of the region is extremely short, and more information regarding the climate and the type of habitats found in the region should be given. Furthermore, the previous studies of the area are only briefly mentioned but no true comparison is made, which would be very important to evaluate the importance of the article for the scientific community. As of yet, the article lacks many important details and comparisons, as a whole.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable. No corrections here.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>I would suggest only few corrections, which can be found under "track changes" in the original manuscript. The last sentence should especially be clarified, as it is somehow confusingly written.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>As stated previously many sections should be considerably expanded, especially: A) the Introduction, where the previous findings from the entire area should be appropriately presented (as of yet, only some references were given, nothing more); B) the study area, where more information regarding climate zone and habitat types should be given; C) Results and Discussion section, as it is, is almost none-existing. In this section the results from the University should be compared to other similar findings (similar studies from other countries/regions) and especially to the other findings from the Gujarat region and/or Western Ghats. Also, some results/observations of important host plants for the most important butterfly species should be given.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>As this is a simple and relatively straight-forward faunistic article, the results/findings/methods are seemingly fit. Thus, the article seems scientifically robust and technically sound, especially since all the photographs of the butterflies are also given. The only mayor corrections should be applied under the photographs (English names changed to Latin ones) and especially in the table of the species, where the butterfly species inside each of the five families should be order according to the appropriate taxonomic nomenclature and not by their English names. If the nomenclature posses a serious obstacle for the authors they should at least order the species according to the alphabetical order of their Latin names, which should be given in the first column. Note that the photographs were deleted from the file only because the file was too large to upload. The photographs should still be included in the final article!</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The first reference should definitely be updated, since a never version of the act was already published. The same goes for the IUNC list of red species. Also, "anonymous" can never be named as the "author" of any reference, but appropriate ministry/organ of the government should be named, since it is a national act. Additionally, all internet references must be provided with the internet links to the</p>	

Review Form 3

	exact web page source, as well as the dates on which the web pages was accessed.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English used in the manuscript is simple, yet suitable. Anyhow, a few corrections should be applied. View the "track changes" inside the original manuscript and correct some of the other somehow odd written sentences and grammar. Otherwise the English in the manuscript should be sufficient.	
Optional/General comments	As I personally favour the publication of such (despite very simple) faunistic studies, I would support the publication of this article, but only after the mayor revisions of the manuscript.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luka Sturm
Department, University & Country	University of Ljubljana, Slovenia