



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3596
Title of the Manuscript:	The survival, Investigation on the impact of different water treatments on the growth, and health of ornamental fishes raised under the water conditions
Type of the 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
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes , the manuscript is important for the scientific community and to the theme of the journal and will contribute to academic debate. The paper is well structured and the APPROACH used for the study are sound.	Yes, This Paper illustrates results by reliable statistical analysis which expressed by the ANOVA for turbidity removal and health in cultured fish.
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is better to be entitled as: "The impact of different water treatments on survival, growth, and health of ornamental fishes raised under the water condition"	Thank you, sir, for your valuable comments and suggestions. All the corrections were carried out based on your suggestion.
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes , Abstract contain complete information, structured well with logical flow. Despite, unnecessary words and jargons as I just highlighted on the manuscript.	YES, Thank you for your valuable comment.
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes ,	YES, Thank you for your valuable comment.
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	YES, Thank you for your valuable comment.
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes the reference section is sufficient with void of few older ones commented in the manuscript..	YES, Thank you for your valuable comment.



<u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Revision with minor comments as commented in the manuscript	Thank you, sir, for your valuable comments and suggestions. All the corrections were carried out based on your suggestion.
<u>Optional</u> comments	<p>I have now looked at the abstract, key words are OK. The paper is relevant to the theme of the journal and will contribute to academic debate. The paper is well structured and the APPROACH used for the study are sound.</p> <p>In my opinion, therefore, the subject matter of research problem is highly appreciable. It will surely make a contribution to the relevant field of research. The presentation of thoughts in the paper is notable. The paper should be published with no significant revision.</p>	YES, Thank you for your valuable comment.

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

