

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_122917 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Study on the abundance and diversity of soil invertebrate macro-fauna across different land use types at the GKVK Campus, Bengaluru |
| Type of the Article | Short communication |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of ecological research, specifically the relationship between land use and soil biodiversity. The study's focus on soil invertebrate macro-fauna diversity and abundance across different land use types offers valuable insights into how human activities impact soil ecosystems, which is crucial for developing sustainable land management practices. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive approach to exploring these interactions, as it contributes to our understanding of soil health and biodiversity, which are vital for maintaining ecosystem services.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>Impact of Land Use Patterns on Soil Invertebrate Abundance and Diversity at GKVK Campus, Bengaluru</p> <p>It's more suitable as compared to other titles</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>Need to remove grammar mistakes and also clear the results at the end with one sentence</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>Yes, I appropriate but I comment to make sure these changes in the subsection.</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>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodology and thorough data analysis. The research is grounded in a well-established theoretical framework, and the experimental design is carefully crafted to minimize bias and maximize the reliability of the results. The statistical analysis is appropriate and accurately interprets the data, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are both valid and significant. Furthermore, the manuscript demonstrates a clear understanding of the current literature, situating its findings within the broader context of the field, which enhances its scientific credibility.</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 references included in this manuscript are generally appropriate, but there is a need to update them to include more recent studies, especially those published after 2015. It is essential to reference the latest research to ensure that the manuscript reflects the current state of knowledge in the field. I recommend replacing older references with newer ones where applicable, particularly in areas where significant advancements have been made. This will strengthen the manuscript's relevance and alignment with contemporary scientific discussions.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are areas where clarity and precision could be improved. Some sentences may benefit from rephrasing for better readability and coherence. Additionally, the use of technical terminology is appropriate, but ensuring that these terms are clearly defined or used consistently will enhance the manuscript's accessibility to a broader audience. Overall, with minor revisions, the language quality should meet the standards required for academic publication.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Need more hard work on the abstract and especially in the conclusion or discussion.</p> <p>manage writing format properly</p> <p>Conclusion: Summarize the key findings and their implications.</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: | Hazib Ali |
| Department, University & Country | Hazara University Mansehra, Pakistan |