

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4080
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative estimation and Identification of Phospholipids in Gill, Liver tissue of Fresh water fish Channa punctatus (Bloch) In Thin Layer Chromatography (TLC) Sprayed with Dittmer –Lester reagent
Type of the 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.	I have gone through the manuscript and I appreciate the work done by author in the field of Phospholipids in Gill. The experimental setup is explained in detail in manuscript. The result shows the experiment done on different body type of tissue. Table 1 gives in details information about tissue with Rf value which is beneficial for upcoming research articles.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of research article is proper, no suggestion from my side	
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.	Abstract is precise and well written but author need to add Rf value details in abstract which give information about author contribution in research paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsection and structure is well defined but conclusion section is weak, author need to improvise the conclusion section.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Author has explained in details the study of Phospholipids in tissue. In this experiment identification of Phospholipids is mentioned for different body part like brain, liver, muscle, intestine so this study will help to other scientist who work in this field. In detail analysis is provided for Phospholipids tissue with Rf values.	

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	All reference are sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Manuscript English language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No comments	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pradip M. Paithane
Department, University & Country	VPKBIET, SPP University, India

