



Name:	<a href="#"><u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_UPJOZ_3464</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>TAXONOMIC CHECK LIST OF ICHTHYOFAUNAL DIVERSITY IN GOSTHANI RIVER AT TAGARAPUVALASA, VISAKHAPATNAM, ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research Article</b>



## 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b>  (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	<b>Yes</b> <b>It provides rather a complete list of freshwater species with abundance estimations. This may provide a useful basis for further monitoring of changes in species composition of the local ichthyofauna</b>	Thank you sir, for your scientific suggestion and provided some rare species in this article  Thank you sir,
<b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Yes</b>	Yes sir included the exotic species in abstract
<b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	<b>Perhaps the exotic species should be also listed in the Abstract</b>	Yes changed and given Indian sub continent information as per literature
<b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>The 'Introduction' section should be expanded. A brief review of literature on this subject (studies on fish biodiversity in Indian subcontinent) should be provided</b>	Followed as per journal guidelines  Thank you your keen observation
<b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	<b>Yes, the numbers should be rounded to one (not two) decimal (e.g. 1.2 instead of 1.23), as it is an accepted procedure in scientific literature</b>	
<b>6. Are the references sufficient</b>	<b>Yes</b>	



<p>and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>		
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>The Authors failed to explain how the abundance of each species was calculated. From where they took the trophic levels of each species? The species nomenclature and systematics is according to whom?</p>	<p>As per your comment the abundance of fish species are observed at site for every bimonthly sampling. We recorded species dominance and availability of species at every random sampling.</p> <p>The species trophic levels mentioned and referred Fishbase data and provided in our research article. This is supporting to our present study for what percentage trophic levels were present in this river. This is helpful for further studies.</p> <p>Thank you for comment</p>
<p><b><u>Optional</u></b> comments</p>		



**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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	