

Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4575
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural characterization of appendages of different butterfly species (Insecta: Lepidoptera): Review
Type of the Article	Review 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript provides a detailed structural characterization of the appendages of butterfly species, focusing on their morphology and adaptations. While the review consolidates existing knowledge, it lacks fresh perspective that would make it highly engaging for the scientific community. To enhance its importance, the manuscript should emphasize broader implications, such as the role of appendage morphology in ecological interactions, evolutionary adaptations, or applications in biomimetics. Without these additions, its relevance and impact on advancing current understanding remain limited.	Okay

<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title "Structural characterization of appendages of different butterfly species (Insecta: Lepidoptera): Review" is descriptive but could be more concise and engaging. It does convey the content of the article, but it might benefit from highlighting the broader significance or focus.	Noted
<b>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.</b>	The abstract should clearly state the purpose of the review, provide a summary of key findings, and highlight its significance to the scientific community. Add a sentence on the importance of studying butterfly appendages in terms of morphology, ecology, or behavior. Emphasize any novel insights or contributions and connect the findings to broader applications, such as biomimicry or conservation. Ensure it is concise, avoiding unnecessary details, while retaining focus and clarity.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its approach to reviewing the structural characterization of butterfly appendages. It provides relevant information on morphology and functional adaptations, supported by existing literature. However in-depth analysis, and broader implications for the scientific community reduces its overall impact. Improvements in data interpretation, comparative insights, and highlighting applications in fields like biomimicry or conservation biology could enhance its scientific value.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	No, It needs more improvement (add recent references)	Done as suggested

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language of the article requires improvement for scholarly communication, as it may contain grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, or inconsistent terminology. Enhancing clarity, coherence, and academic tone is necessary to ensure it meets the standards of a scientific audience.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p><b>Optional/General Comment:</b>  The review titled "<b>Structural Characterization of Appendages of Different Butterfly Species (Insecta: Lepidoptera)</b>" provides a broad literature collection on the morphological features of butterfly appendages. The paper predominantly reads like a book chapter or a general literature compilation, offering basic information rather than presenting new insights or original perspectives on the topic.</p> <p>Key areas of improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether all images are produced or captured by you? If not did you get permission from published images</li> <li>• Future Ideas: The paper does not propose any significant directions for future research, such as technological advancements (e.g., imaging techniques or molecular studies) or untapped areas of ecological or evolutionary significance. Including such perspectives would enhance its relevance and appeal to a broader audience.</li> </ul> <p>Incorporating these elements would elevate the paper, making it not just a compilation of facts but a more engaging and thought-provoking review that encourages further exploration into the subject.</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>	