



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3382
Title of the Manuscript:	To standardise parameters for preparation of extruded feed using various conventional and non-conventional ingredients
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
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional</u>	<p>Yes , it is important for the scientific community. The methodology for feed preparation as mentioned in this manuscript is important for the aquaculture industry, It will also help the fish farmers for development in fish culture.</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is suitable</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive and properly written</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is not proper as per journal guideline</p> <p>Yes , scientifically correct</p> <p>References are sufficient, but the reference style is different. I have marked in the manuscript</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Done</p>



<u>suggestions/comments</u>	There is a need to improve the language of the manuscript (Grammatical errors need to be rectified) Spellcheck is necessary Format of manuscript like abstract, introduction, material and methods, etc should be properly aligned	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There is a need to write scientific names in italics Follow only one reference style	Okay
<u>Optional</u> comments	No	

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>	