

Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3939
Title of the Manuscript:	UNDERSTORY VEGETATION INFLUENCES INSECT DIVERSITY IN RUBBER PLANTATIONS OF KANYAKUMARI, INDIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This work is an important contribution to the understanding for the management of biodiversity not only in plantations but other human dominated habitats. It is important because it demonstrates the benefit to insect diversity of maintaining a natural shrub layer, fallen leaves and twigs. It is implied that insect diversity would in turn support the diversity of insectivores.	Thank you
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the paper contents	
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.	I would suggest removing the word Plantation 1 in the abstract because for the reader this label has no significance. Instead, define the quality of Plantation 1.	Changed to - Results indicated that insect diversity was significantly higher in one plantation when compared to the other two plantations
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and	The survey methods for the collection and sampling of insects has been outlined and has applied to the 3 plantation plots. I would have been helpful to indicate if the same sample methods were applied to the three plots compared. It is merely implied. The wording that "water was used instead of killing agents to prevent	Line added - The stated methods were applied to all three plantations during the period of study. The horticultural species were not studied and so are not spoken about.

technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	insects from escaping” is not well reasoned. I would have appreciated a tabulation of the shrub species in the understory. Were they native or horticultural?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	This is not my specialty and therefore I abstain from commenting.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	Educating plantation owners, park administrators, and the public about the benefits to biodiversity of maintaining a more “natural” ground cover cannot be overstated.	

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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>No</p>	Thank you for the positive feedback.