



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3378
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing the potential of naturally-stabilized earthen ponds for hill aquaculture: A demonstration using fish species combinations in Meghalaya
Type of the 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>See the attachment</p>	<p>Mentioned</p> <p>Its area; the depths are mentioned in the next-to-next sentence</p> <p>All these fish varieties belong to the family of Carps, with feeding habits that vary from herbivorous to omnivorous. They require feeds that contain crude protein in the range of 20-25% for better growth. In our study, we initially fed them with a commercial pellet feed and then a mixture of rice bran and mustard oil later. The crude protein level was 24.2% in the former and 18.8% in the latter. Along with supplementary feeding, there was sufficient plankton as natural food for fish.</p> <p>The feeding rate was 2% of fish body weight daily, throughout the culture period. The feeding rate was adjusted bi-monthly according to fish biomass.</p> <p>Yes, still if we have enough facility and resources, we can do it monthly also.</p> <p>No, it was just a quantitative analysis, not qualitative analysis</p> <p>. Deleted Deleted</p>

		<p>Setting error</p> <p>Data is presented as mean \pm S.D.</p> <p>As mentioned in the last column of Table 2, it should be ≥ 5 ppm.</p> <p>In the last column, it is 'b' value not p-value, I am talking about the fish condition factor, which is indicated by the 'b' in the linear regression equation $y = a + bx$</p> <p>The FCR is calculated based on the overall fish production system, not how individual fish performed. We provided a common feed to all fish stocked together in a system.</p> <p>At the size of stocking, all fish were equal in size across the ponds.</p> <p>As I said earlier, we used three ponds without replications; thus, statistical comparison was not possible. Our study is a kind of exploratory study to assess how naturally stabilized earthen ponds located in Meghalaya hills respond to scientific fish culture combining different species.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional 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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	