



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

**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><b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b></p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b></p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. These findings have important value for disease prevention in the community at the sampling location</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes, there were some corrections regarding statements and consistency</b></p> <p><b>Yes, but</b></p> <p><b>1. some corrections regarding writing case amounts: "7,00,000"; "8,00,000"</b></p> <p><b>2. Ordering the references, from number [3] jump to number [30] → please revised</b></p> <p><b>Its Ok, please revise some corrections</b></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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. many references are not cited in the text, from [19] – [29]</li> <li>2. Reference in the text, please make in order, created sequentially, not jumping from 3 to 30</li> </ol> <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><b>Minor</b> 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><b>Optional</b> comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Raden Roro Upiek Ngesti Wibawaning Astuti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia</b>