



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3211
Title of the Manuscript:	Deltamethrin's toxicological Impact on Freshwater crab <i>Barytelphusa cunicularis</i>
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>It is important, since it shows the impact that the crab species mentioned suffers due to exposure to the substance deltamethrin, widely used in crops.</p> <p>I agree with the title.</p> <p>The summary is well-reasoned and explanatory, comprising all the parts that make up a summary.</p> <p>Yes, they are consistent.</p> <p>Yes, because it has a scientific and statistical basis.</p> <p>They are sufficient, but the most recent date from 2021, they could present some more recent ones.</p>	<p>Thank you so much for your valuable comments</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Relatively simple work, but one that will	



	<p>meet the reader's desires.</p> <p>I found the summary very confusing at first, the objective differs throughout the text.</p>	
Optional comments	<p>The graphs in the article came to me non-standardized, evaluate the results only through the texts.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the non-standardized graphs in our article. We apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused during your evaluation process.</p> <p>We understand the importance of presenting clear and standardized graphical representations of our results. To address this concern, we have carefully revised the text to provide comprehensive descriptions and interpretations of the data presented in the graphs.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	