



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3191
Title of the Manuscript:	AN IN-DEPTH STUDY ON TRACE METALS IN NEYYAR RIVER SITES, KERALA, INDIA
Type of the Article	Original 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? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (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 suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>It's just okay</p> <p>Needs to be re-written</p> <p>Seems Appropriate</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Title of the manuscript changed</p> <p>Abstract rewritten</p>
<p><u>Major</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>1. There are numerous grammatical mistakes throughout. Manuscript</p>	

	<p>must be re-written for English language.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. During sample collection, what was pH of solution that was maintained? What was concentration of HNO₃ added? From where it was procured? How was pH monitored? 3. For metal testing, APHA and FSSAI manual was used and no reference to these has been provided. 4. How was it possible to reach temperature of 120°C for water when boiling point of water is 100°C? 5. In table 1, units are missing for annual average. 6. The references used are too old. Authors must refer to recent data. 	
Optional comments: Major revision or reject		



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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Revised manuscript title2. Abstract rewritten3. Introduction changed4. Study area is mentioned5. Grammar correction done6. Procedure changed7. Reference modified