

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3902
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Low-Dose Effects and Non-monotonous Dose Response of Butyl p-hydroxybenzoate, or Butylparaben on Female Wistar rats
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	This manuscript is interesting because it has new results which might change the direction of therapeutic usage of Butyl p-hydroxybenzoate. The research can be extended to include the benefits of the same compound in stimulating immune response.	We are really grateful to the reviewer and the Editors of UPJOZ for considering our manuscript and for giving us the opportunity to revised the same. Indeed, the valuable and insightful comments from the reviewer helped us to improve our understanding on writing a research paper. All the review comments are addressed by the authors for revising the manuscript. All the corrections are made as per the instruction of the reviewer. We are ready to do any further corrections if requires
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable.	The authors are really thankful to the reviewer
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 the abstract is comprehensive.	The authors are really thankful to the reviewer
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes the structure is appropriate.	The authors are really thankful to the reviewer

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.	It is scientifically robust since it presented new results regarding Butyl p-hydroxybenzoate, and no other research has outlined the Geno toxicity of this compound and alteration of lipid profile.	Thank you for the appreciation
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	The authors are really thankful to the reviewer
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	The authors are really thankful to the reviewer
<u>Optional/General</u> 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>	No ethical issues are there in the manuscript