



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3211
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Deltamethrin's toxicological Impact on Freshwater crab <i>Barytelphusa cunicularis</i></b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's feedback</b>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></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><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Relatively simple work, but one that will meet the reader's desires.</p> <p>I found the summary very confusing at first, the objective differs throughout the text.</p>	



<b>Optional</b> comments	The graphs in the article came to me non-standardized, evaluate the results only through the texts.	
--------------------------	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Euclides Pereira e Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto Federal do Pará, Brasil</b>