



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3199
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical analysis of zooplankton diversity in Hasanparthy lake of Hanumakonda district of Telangana State.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Yes, I think this research is quite important</p> <p>The title of this article is appropriate</p> <p>The abstract in this article is not comprehensive. There are several things that have been suggested in the abstract</p> <p>manuscript structure is appropriate</p> <p>There is little doubt that the numbers in the results do not match those found in the table. In addition, the discussion in this manuscript is poor. We suggest that it should be more thorough and the discussion should be more detailed.</p> <p>references are sufficient</p>	<p>Thank you sir/madam</p> <p>I had made all the suggestions as mentioned by you sir.</p> <p>Due to some technical mistake it happens sir. I changed the same with sincerely</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	revision required	Done sir



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>	This research is helps to know the status of famous temple attaching waterbody.