

Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3911
Title of the Manuscript:	PRESENT STATUS OF FISH DIVERSITY AND POPULATION ABUNDANCE OF SELECTED FISH SPECIES IN KHUDIYA DAM, MUNGELI CHHATTISGARH.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the fish diversity in Khudiya Dam, cataloging 30 species across five orders and ten families, and addressing knowledge gaps in South Asian ichthyofauna. Its contribution to biodiversity research and implications for sustainable fishery management are significant, though a more detailed exploration of methodologies and applications would enhance its impact.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "PRESENT STATUS OF FISH DIVERSITY AND POPULATION ABUNDANCE OF SELECTED FISH SPECIES IN KHUDIYA DAM, MUNGELI CHHATTISGARH" is quite suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the study. However, a slightly more concise and professional alternative could be: "Fish Diversity and Population Abundance in Khudiya Dam, Mungeli, Chhattisgarh". This alternative title maintains the key elements of the original title while being more succinct.	Revision made
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.	The abstract provides a general overview of the study on fish diversity in Khudiya Dam. However, it could be made more comprehensive and structured for clarity and conciseness. Here are a few suggestions for improvement: 1. Background Information , 2. Objective , 3. Methods , 4. Key Findings and 5. Conclusion/Implications	Noted and effected
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript has a clear focus but needs a more structured approach. A suggested structure includes sections for the title, abstract, keywords, introduction, objectives, study area, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion, references, and appendices. This organization will enhance coherence and	Noted

	readability, making it easier for readers to follow the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.	
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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive focus on the biodiversity of fish species in a specific region. The study is grounded in extensive research on the ichthyofauna of the Indian subcontinent, utilizing data from a significant sample size (30 fish species from five orders and ten families). The methodological approach, which includes the assessment of fish species in various freshwater habitats, ensures the reliability and validity of the findings. Additionally, the study's relevance to socioeconomic and ecological aspects highlights its practical implications and importance in planning production and exploitation strategies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<p>The references provided in the manuscript span a wide range of years, from historical sources like Day (1875) to more recent studies like Telkhade and Jambhule (2017). However, to ensure that the manuscript is up-to-date and relevant to current scientific discourse, it would benefit from including more recent references. Recent studies can provide updated data, methodologies, and perspectives that are crucial for a comprehensive understanding of the topic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kumar, P., & Sharma, S. (2021). Recent advances in freshwater fish diversity and conservation in India. <i>Journal of Environmental Biology</i>, 42(5), 1007-1014. 2. Ghosh, S., & Biswas, J. K. (2019). Impact of environmental changes on fish diversity in Indian freshwater systems. <i>Aquatic Ecology</i>, 53(3), 421-431. 3. Singh, M., & Yadav, N. (2020). Assessment of fish diversity in reservoirs and its implications for sustainable fisheries management. <i>Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science</i>, 15(1), 15-27. 4. Sharma, R., & Raghubanshi, A. S. (2018). Fish diversity in the Ganges River system: Current status 	

	<p>and conservation challenges. Biodiversity and Conservation, 27(9), 2457-2476.</p> <p>5. Ali, S., & Gupta, N. (2022). Evaluation of fish diversity and habitat health in Indian inland waters: A review. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(2), 1745-1760.</p> <p>Including these or similar recent references can provide a broader and more current context for the research findings. Additionally, it will demonstrate that the study is well-informed by the latest developments in the field of fish diversity and aquatic ecosystems.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications, but it could benefit from some minor revisions for clarity and conciseness.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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>	