



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3634
Title of the Manuscript:	Methyl Parathion Induced Haematology Profile Alteration Of Climbing Perch, Anabas testudineus (Bloch.)
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)	Yes, pollution especially from agriculture may impact aquatic organisms.	Noted
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable, except they could consider adding the study area	Okay
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	It lacks an objectives, and results are not clearly stated (average values)	Revised
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There is need of restructuring the materials and methods as indicated on manuscript.	Done
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	It is	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention	They are sufficient and uptodate	



in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Consider. Restructuring the discussion There was redundance and lack of systematics (finish discussing one thing before moving to another). Let there be selection be studies to compare There were sentence which were left to be stand alone paragraphs and they did not make Sense. The writer refers to figure one only and there are other figures.	Noted
<u>Optional</u> 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>	