



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	Experimental/empirical research.

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional</u></p>	<p>The manuscript can be beneficial to science, it can add value to scientific findings.</p> <p>The title is suitable with little adjustment. I suggest the title to be: Enzymatic Modifications, As Biomarker for Heavy Metal Toxicity in <i>Catla catla</i> a Fresh Water Fish.</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive, there is need to mention a brief of methodology, results, conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions.</p> <p>The subsections are accurate and appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically inclined.</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p>	<p>1.Comment: Response : 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.Comment: Response : Agreed ,I have modified as per the reviewers suggestion. Thank you</p> <p>Comment 3: Response: I agree with the reviewer's assessment.</p> <p>Comment 4: Response: Thank You, I agree with the reviewer's assessment.</p> <p>Comment 5: Response: Agreed.</p> <p>Comment 6: Response: I agree with the reviewer's assessment.</p>



<u>suggestions/comments</u>		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscripts is okay for publication with minor corrections.	Thank you so much .I have rectified all minor corrections
<u>Optional</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment 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

