

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

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.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it fills a knowledge gap and offers new insights that could guide future research. I appreciate its thorough approach and the potential impact of its findings, though some areas could benefit from further exploration.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and shows all sections of the article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections and structure are well-organized, supporting a clear and logical flow of ideas, which enhances readability and coherence.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust, with a sound methodology and proper statistical analysis, ensuring valid results. The authors effectively ground their research in the relevant literature, demonstrating strong technical understanding.	

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and sufficient.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Dear Author, The language and English quality are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but minor grammatical and stylistic improvements could enhance readability. There are some notes on language and punctuation that should be reviewed in the article.	
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asmaa Ahmed Emam
Department, University & Country	Ain Shams University, Egypt