

Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4080
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative estimation and Identification of Phospholipids in Gill, Liver, Intestine, Muscle, Brain tissue of Fresh water fish Channa punctatus (Bloch) In Thin Layer Chromatography (TLC) Sprayed with Dittmer – Lester reagent
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is original research paper. It is very informative paper for the people who are fish oriented diet. It will also help to the researchers for further study.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable	Thanks
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	ok
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	ok
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and	This research paper is scientifically correct.	

technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Author has included sufficient references in good pattern.	ok
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language of the article is good.	
Optional/General comments	The article is scientifically written and very beneficial.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	