



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3707
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF <i>Vibrio.sp</i> FROM MARINE FISHES OF MUMBAI, MAHARASHTRA.
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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(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</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the prevalence of Vibrio species in marine fish and the lack of public awareness about the associated health risks. This research is important for the scientific community as it highlights the need for better handling practices and increased public education on food safety to prevent gastrointestinal diseases caused by Vibrio. Further studies could build on this work to develop more effective strategies for monitoring and controlling Vibrio contamination in marine environments and fish markets.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Most of the sentences do not convey the intended meaning. Major sentence corrections should be done before publishing it.</p>	<p>Sentences are reframed in the right context.</p>



<p>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 in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Scientifically correct</p> <p>Sufficient. May add more of them in discussion part</p>	<p>References are added in discussion.</p>
---	--	--



Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript seem to be done by an amateur or could be lack of time. It is not well scripted. Accept only after proper correction of sentences. Don't be in a hurry	
Optional comments		

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>	