

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_83773
Title of the Manuscript:	Zooplanktonic community assessment over space and time: A biomonitoring tool in an artificial lake
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARTICLE MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION The chapter provides an adequate overview of the important role of zooplankton in the ecosystem. The purpose of the study is well justified.</p> <p>2. MATERIAL AND METHODS The presentation of the studied area, the sampling method and the analysis are appropriate for the research</p> <p>3. RESULTS There are many errors in writing the species names in the text section and in the tables showing the species lists (see corrected article)</p> <p>4. DISCUSSION The chapter is appropriate, some additions are required, see Minor Revision comments</p> <p>5. CONCLUSION This chapter contains general findings.</p>	Thank you for the reviews. The corrections has been done.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. Species names need to be corrected in the text and in the species lists (Tables 1, 2, 3).</p> <p>2. What may explain the quantitative increase in some cases in the lower depths as well?</p> <p>3. In Figure 5, the numeric value is missing from the scale.</p> <p>4. Reference is made to physicochemical parameter ranges. Which are because they are not in the text.</p> <p>5. What are the pollution-tolerant copepodit species, - it is necessary to name them.</p>	<p>The species names has been corrected</p> <p>This has been explained</p> <p>The sale has been properly fixed</p> <p>This has been duly corrected</p> <p>The copepod species has been named</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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)	