



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3375
Title of the Manuscript:	Biodiversity and its Role in Sustainable Development: A Comprehensive Review
Type of the 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? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (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>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>It is simple general information and don not looks like the review rather it seems encyclopaedic information compilation. It is a very shall and mostly based on the general truth and lacks novelty in idea</p> <p>There is no problem with title</p> <p>More or less</p> <p>Not as such it looks the compilation of information from AI. The reference writing style must be revised to fit to the style of the Journal. Its paragraph arranment also need to be checked.</p> <p>Relatively the facts are correct</p> <p>Some part is not supported by references. In general it is very difficult to say it is a review paper it stated in the abstract part.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>		



Optional comments	It is very difficult to consider this paper as review paper it is better to label as a compiled paper.	
--------------------------	--	--

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:	Mohammed Kasso Geda
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia