

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4534
Title of the Manuscript:	The Fiddler Crab of the Sundarbans: A Call for Conservation
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A good reminder on conserving fiddler crabs	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This is not a review paper but an editorial or OpEd by the author/s; a review paper should have more than 80 references	
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.	I think the abstract should be lengthened to 200 words, the authors can write more	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	I think the paper needs to be more specific in its approach as it seems to be very broad or general and what the authors are saying also applies to crabs and shrimps. The authors could not even name the fiddler crabs found in Figure 1, as there are no labels of the names of the different fiddler crabs shown by them.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think the authors should cite more literature, and I am asking or challenging the authors to be more specific in terms of their call for conservation...for instance in the case of the Sundarbans, why conserve it? When is it more specific or in what specific way can the conservation start and where to	

	start should be answered by the authors so that the readers could understand the call to action	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	the authors lack background of the study and the objectives of the paper are not clear; also the discussion does not clearly show about threats and possible solutions to these threats, no data are presented by the authors...I believe this is more like opinion paper instead of a review 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:	Edison D. Macusi
Department, University & Country	Davao Oriental State University, Philippines