

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_122869
Title of the Manuscript:	Ecological Role of spiders in Terrestrial Ecosystem and Their Conservation Priorities.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The article presents a comprehensive overview of spiders' ecological impact in terrestrial habitats, emphasising the necessity for their protection. Given the increasing risks to biodiversity throughout the world, this issue is critical and relevant. I admire the authors' efforts to bring together information from diverse sources to give a comprehensive understanding of spider ecology and conservation. However, there are some areas where the article may be strengthened to increase its integrity and effect.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable and accurately reflects the content.	
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 some restructuring. I suggest adding a brief mention of the research methodology used and including more specific findings or conclusions. The keywords are appropriate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, following a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. However, the "Research methodology" section could be expanded to provide more details on the literature search and analysis process.	
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.	Scientifically, the manuscript presents a good overview of spider ecology and conservation issues. It draws from a wide range of sources to support its arguments. However, some claims would benefit from more recent citations, and there are areas where more critical analysis of the information presented would strengthen the paper's scientific robustness.	
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 there is room for improvement. Some key references are relatively old, and the manuscript would benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies, particularly in the areas of spider conservation and emerging threats.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where clarity and precision could be improved. Some sentences are overly long and complex, which can hinder understanding. Additionally, there are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be addressed.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider adding a section on future research directions in spider ecology and conservation. 2. The discussion of spider cultural significance is interesting but could be more tightly integrated with the main themes of ecology and conservation. 3. A table summarizing the key ecosystem services provided by spiders would be a valuable addition to the manuscript. 	

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:	Sarthak Chaudhary
Department, University & Country	Saurashtra University, India