

Review Form2

Book Name:	Contemporary Research and Perspectives in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2600
Title of the Manuscript:	Zooplankton diversity and their monthly variation in ChakkiTalab, Bodhan, Telangana
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Chakkitalab is one of the lakes in Bodhan, Telangana, India. In fresh water bodies zooplankton play an important role in maintaining the ecological The zooplankton diversity of Chakkitalabwas evaluated on monthly basis for one year, October 2015 to September 2016.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The year of study can be included.	
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 agree	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I agree	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The discussion of the manuscript should be expanded. The literature should be reviewed and the results compared with findings reported in other lakes in India, or similar ones.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references included for the discussion of the manuscript should be expanded.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I agree	
Optional/General comments	The article is interesting, concrete and precise. It has a good scientific structure. It lacks discussion; the results must be contrasted with the published literature to give scientific support to the manuscript.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jenniffer Alejandra Castellanos Garzon
Department, University & Country	Unidad Central del Valle del Cauca, Colombia