



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
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Ok.</p> <p>No, The abstract needs to be reviewed and rewritten.</p> <p>Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is ok.</p> <p>No, more recent references should be used.</p>	



<p>in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>A general review should be done. Then the abstract should be modified according to the changes made.</p>	
<p><u>Optional</u> 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eisa Hajiradkouchak
Department, University & Country	Caspian Sea Ecological Research Center, Iran