



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3506
Title of the Manuscript:	INTERTIDAL BIVALVE DIVERSITY AND FISHERY OF THE GOSTANI ESTUARY, BHIMUNIPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM, EAST COAST OF INDIA
Type of the Article	



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(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>The work is very well oriented, however, although the multiple editorial details are not relevant because they are minor, the work is well formulated, since the research guides us to a study that revealed that the presence of 13 species belonging to the bivalvia class which were dominant Taxa in the Gostani estuary.</p> <p>This work should be published immediately after making the final minor adjustments since its argument regarding the diversity of bivalve species is very good, where, of 13 species, 6 orders, 8 families and 11 genera were observed from February 2023 to March 2024.</p> <p>Dear fellow editor, I am clear with these 7 points of suggestions, in this sense I obviously owe them to the high quality of the articles that I am reviewing, but nevertheless I can respond to them.</p> <p>Yeah! The Manuscript is important to the scientific community and also to expand knowledge in the study of the diversity of intertidal bivalves and fisheries of the Gostani estuary, Bhimunipatnam, Visakhapatnam, east coast of India</p> <p>In my opinion, the title of the article is in line with</p>	



<p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>what was carried out in the study.</p> <p>The summary perfectly details what was done in the article, as well as the data reflected in the tables.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct. By knowing the procedures used in the study we realize the meticulous work carried out and the systematics.</p> <p>The References used in the article are those necessary. And even in studies you can use a few. This has a better presentation if it is numbered in bold.</p>	
---	--	--



Minor REVISION comments	The details are easy and quick to correct to give a better meaning to the writing of the article and thus expand its understanding, without giving relevance to the number of corrections detected and improved in order to perfect this article to be published.	
Optional comments	<p>Examine the article carefully before publishing it, since the corrections, although few, do not affect the publication, therefore the final touches must be refined so that the satisfactory publication is carried out in favor of knowledge about the diversity of bivalve species that They are distributed on the east coast of India.</p> <p>This article shows us A study process on the diversity of bivalves present in the Gostani estuary, Bhimunipatnam, Visakhapatnam, east coast of India.</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>	



Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rigoberto Alarcon Rojas
Department, University & Country	Universidad Politecnica Territorial De Merida "Kleber Ramirez", Venezuela