

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_129419
Title of the Manuscript:	Biodiversity of aquatic insects in kalsa river (Chanfi) of Nainital district, Uttarakhand, India.
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Wetlands are among the most valuable ecosystems on earth. AS they are of great importance from ecological, economic, and socio-cultural Perspectives. In the ecological dimension, with the conservation of aquatic wildlife. Economically, accesses to wetlands develop the tourism industry which is a good source of income for local communities. Also, wetlands favour seasonal agriculture. Socio-culturally, wetlands are a place for recreation that can be very inspiring due to their visual and aesthetic qualities. This research aligns with the global effort for the preservation of wetlands through participatory management which is essential for biodiversity conservation and minimizing the degradation and loss of wetlands.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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 of the article is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Results: the form of interpretation of figures and tables are not correct. Authors must not begin the sentence by “the Figure/Table shows that”. It’s better to comment and put in brackets Figure/Table. Figures: Authors must put the titles at the level of axis.	

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:	Ndjouondo Gildas Parfait
Department, University & Country	The University of Bamenda, Cameroon