

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
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

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides essential data on the current state of aquatic biodiversity in Khudiya Dam. Such studies are critical for understanding the health and sustainability of freshwater ecosystems, which are vital for maintaining ecological balance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable and can be left as it is.	
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 suggest some families found should be added to the abstract. The result is too vague and the introductory part is too lengthy.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The methodology section needs to be more explicit. What were the gears used in harvesting the fish? How many times were fish harvested?	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and	The manuscript is correct, The findings can inform conservation strategies and fisheries management practices, aiding in the preservation of native species and the prevention of overexploitation. Additionally, this research can serve as a baseline for future studies, contributing to long-term environmental monitoring and	

technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	policy-making efforts.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More recent references especially for the discussion section should be used.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	To a large extent, yes.	
Optional/General comments	The result section can have alongside the names of the families and species, the numbers of each species recorded during the study for each month and possibly, the sex ratio and sizes.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hauwa O. Sadiq
Department, University & Country	University of Abuja, Nigeria