



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3382
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>To standardise parameters for preparation of extruded feed using various conventional and non-conventional ingredients</b>
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
<b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b>  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b>  (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>At least some extent, the manuscript is scientifically oriented</b></p> <p><b>It is not suitable. I have given the appropriate title</b></p> <p>Preparation of extruded feed using various conventional and non-conventional ingredients"</p> <p><b>The abstract is comprehensive</b></p> <p><b>The subsections are appropriate</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript is scientifically correct</b></p> <p><b>The references are sufficient. Some are recent while some are outdated</b></p>	<p>Corrected all</p>



	<b>The discussion is not well related to the present study. The author can try to show if his own results are in agreement or not with other authors.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The author can do the corrections and apply the study to other researchers findings	Noted
<b>Optional</b> comments		

## **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>	