



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3164
Title of the Manuscript:	Enzymatic Modifications, As Biomarker for Heavy Metal Toxicity in <i>Catla catla</i> a Fresh Water Fish
Type of the Article	Research 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 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points,</p>	<p>1. Although this subject is interesting and applicable, but there are some technical problems in the paper which should be corrected.</p> <p>2. I think it is better to correct the species name Do not use abbreviation in Title, what is SOD?</p> <p>3. No, it does not have the structure of an abstract, I suggest that authors explain the following items briefly in abstract section: about the use of enzymes as biomarker and also about the studied species as introduction, methods they have used, obtained results and finally their conclusion</p> <p>4. Introduction section is not comprehensive at all, authors should first introduce the species and explain about it, then talk about the heavy metal pollutions and effect of them on fishes, talk about the other studied on this topic and finally say why they did this study. Result section is not complete, it has technical problems, for example, the concentrations of heavy metals did not mention, Table 1 which is mentioned in the text is not available, and some things which are related to discussion are stated in result section!! Discussion section is not suitable, authors must analyse their results and state strong reasons for each result.</p> <p>5. Yes. Although I think that a control treatment should</p>	<p>1.Response: Thank you sir i have rectified . Agreed. It is important for scientific community as it gives a valuable contribution to the scientific field by monitoring the heavy metals in the water body at an earliest , in order to protect ecosystem health.</p> <p>2. Response: Agreed. I have rectified all as per reviewers suggestion.</p> <p>3. Comment 3: Response: I agree with the reviewer's assessment.I have done all the changes as per reviewers recommendations.</p> <p>Comment 4: Response: Thank you sir for pointing this out. I have revised the suggested content especially table.1 in the methodology portion as per reviewer's recommendation.</p> <p>Comment 5: Response :Agreed with reviewers comments,have added.</p>



<u>reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments</u>	have been considered in the materials and methods section. 6. Yes.	Comment 6: Response :Thank you for your keen observation
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Paper needs deep revision in writing (needs deep Language editing) ✓ Authors should be able to separate different parts of their paper. 	Thank you for correcting me. All changes have been done.
<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> Thank you Im totally agreed with the riewewers all corrections which they point out on my manuscript and i have sincerely made all changes by the suggestions of reviwers.
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	NO