



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3467
Title of the Manuscript:	MORPHOMETRIC ANALYSIS AND CONDITION FACTOR OF FRESHWATER PRAWN, <i>Macrobrachium lamarrei</i> (CRUSTACEA - DECAPODA) FROM THE GOMTI RIVER , LUCKNOW (U.P.) INDIA
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)	1. yes	Noted
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	2. yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	3. no	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	4. no, there is no subsections in the results section.	Revised
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	5. yes	
6. Are the references sufficient	6. some are recent, but there are obsolete	



<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>references stipulated by the authors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional comments</p>	<p>Although this is a good study, the author failed to clearly state the gap of the study, significance or even the objectives. There are no specific methods used by the author/s for the data collection. The conclusion is also unclear. Further, the author also makes claims that are not supported by the data from the study and other studies. The author failed to discuss the results of the study.</p> <p>For specific comments, please refer to the attached manuscript. I trust that the author can see the pattern in my comments and apply these comments to the entirety of the paper and not just the ones that I highlighted.</p>	



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