



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3710
Title of the Manuscript:	Length-Weight Relationship and Relative Condition factor of Paratrypauchen microcephalus (Bleeker, 1860) along the Mumbai coast
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘lack of Novelty’, provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>)



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	The results of the present study are good, but the discussion part is poorly done. Please do a rewrite. It would be better if you brought the coefficient (b) of the growth pattern. Ok.	Sure, I will make the changes. ok
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, The abstract needs to be reviewed and rewritten.	The abstract would be reviewed and rewritten.
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	Thank you
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript is ok.	Thank you
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	No, more recent references should be used.	There is less data available on the fish due to less research done on it. All the recent papers available have been included in the references
6. Are the references sufficient		



<p>and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>A general review should be done. Then the abstract should be modified according to the changes made.</p>	<p>Sure</p>
<p>Optional comments</p>		

PART 2:

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