



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3446
Title of the Manuscript:	Conservation status of Reptilia in Agasthyamalai Biosphere Reserve, Western Ghats, India and its environment
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
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	I am not an expert on India herpetofauna, but I suppose that it would be important.	Yes Important
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Agreed
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	Agreed
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Agreed
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	Agreed
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes	Agreed
<u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>		

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methods: what was the total length of the excursions in km? in which part of the reserve they were located? 2. Methods: add the map of the study site and locations surveyed in the present study. 3. Table 1: it is not clear what is the difference between “forest” and “terrestrial” habitat for forests are part of terrestrial habitat; I would suggest to choose different term for “terrestrial” 4. Table 1: the observation frequency column should be added with information on which species are rare and which species common; 5. Table 1: if the presence of a species in the reserve is known only from the literature, the source should also be given in this table.; if it is the authors own data it also should be indicated there 6. Table 1 and Figure 1: mark the endemic species for the study area of western Ghats in the 	<p>We conducted each survey for about 15-20 days and per day we use to travel/walk 50 to 100 kilometer . we covered different forest ranges in Agasthyamalai BR. Map not given</p> <p>Forest and terrestrial both are same</p> <p>Many of the species we sighted during survey <i>Calotes versicolor</i>, <i>Sphenomorphus dussumieri</i> , etc were common, some snakes are rare .</p> <p>Majority of the species are sighted during survey and some species are based on literature like <i>Vijayachelys sylvatica</i> and <i>Agasthyagama beddomii</i>, out of these two species I sighted <i>Agasthyagama beddomii</i> in Agasthyamalai , so for I have not sighted cane turtle. In the table given complete list of Reptiles , whereas in Figure 1 given family wise percentage of species</p> <p>In all it is followed</p> <p>It is in whole western Ghats</p>

	<p>Table 1 and delete the Figure 1</p> <p>7. Results and Discussion: there is a weird arrangement of the cited works; e.g. a sentence starts with “[6] in their study from KMTR...” instead of “Ishwar et al. [6] in their study from KMTR...”; this should be corrected all over the manuscript.</p> <p>8. In the last paragraph it is not clear to which ecosystem 37 species are endemic. Are they endemic to the reserve or wider area?</p> <p>9. English language could be improved throughout the whole manuscript</p>	Yes improved.
--	--	---------------

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>	