

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it addresses a significant gap in our understanding of insect diversity in rubber plantations in India, specifically in Kanyakumari.• The study provides important insights into how understory vegetation and plantation management practices affect insect biodiversity in monoculture settings.• These findings are particularly relevant given the global concern over insect decline and the need for sustainable agricultural practices.• The research also contributes to our understanding of seasonal variations in insect populations, which is crucial for developing effective conservation strategies.• Overall, this manuscript offers a solid foundation for future studies on biodiversity in agricultural landscapes and informs sustainable plantation management practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The title "UNDERSTORY VEGETATION INFLUENCES INSECT DIVERSITY IN RUBBER PLANTATIONS OF KANYAKUMARI, INDIA" is suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus and findings of the study.• However, to make it more concise and impactful, a slight modification could be considered: "Understory Vegetation Drives Insect Diversity in Kanyakumari Rubber Plantations, India"	

<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract is comprehensive, covering the background, objectives, methods, main findings, and implications of the study. However, it could be improved by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including specific quantitative results (e.g., diversity indices, number of species found) • Briefly mentioning the data collection methods • Adding a sentence on the implications for plantation management or conservation • Condensing some background information to focus more on the study's unique contributions 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure appears appropriate, following the standard scientific format (Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, Conclusion). However, the Results and Discussion sections could be separated for clarity, and subheadings within these sections could improve organization and readability.</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>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The study design, including the selection of three different plantations and the use of various insect sampling methods, provides a comprehensive approach to assessing insect diversity. The use of established diversity indices (Shannon and Simpson) adds credibility to the analysis. The consideration of seasonal variations and environmental factors demonstrates a thorough approach to understanding the dynamics of insect populations. The findings are presented with appropriate caution, acknowledging the need for further research, which indicates scientific integrity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references provided are sufficient and recent, covering a range of relevant studies and publications. • Follow the Author's guidelines for reference style. • Check all the references should be provided for the mentioned incitations 	

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are some minor grammatical issues and areas where clarity could be improved. A thorough proofreading and perhaps review by a native English speaker or professional editor could enhance the manuscript's readability and precision.	
Optional/General comments	Check punctuation marks Italicize scientific names	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marri Keerthana
Department, University & Country	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, India