



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3709
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity and Relative Abundance of Mosquito (Order: Diptera) within human habitat in the district of Thane (Maharashtra).
Type of the Article	Research article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>)



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>Yes. These findings have important value for disease prevention in the community at the sampling location</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, there were some corrections regarding statements and consistency</p> <p>Yes, but</p> <p>1. some corrections regarding writing case amounts: "7,00,000"; "8,00,000"</p> <p>2. Ordering the references, from number [3] jump to number [30] → please revised</p> <p>Its Ok, please revise some corrections</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review my manuscript and for providing detailed corrections and suggestions. I appreciate your effort in helping to improve the quality of the paper.</p> <p>Regarding the corrections, I've revised the paper accordingly. Your suggestion has indeed improved the readability.</p>



<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Actually, yes But: 1. many references are not cited in the text, from [19] – [29] 2. Reference in the text, please make in order, created sequentially, not jumping from 3 to 30</p> <p>Please revised in the text the order of references, and if there were only 18 references that was cited in the text its ok.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>I have made notes or comments, hopefully author can be followed. After revision, this manuscript is suitable for publication</p>	
<p>Optional comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

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>	