



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3596
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The survival, Investigation on the impact of different water treatments on the growth, and health of ornamental fishes raised under the water conditions</b>
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
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b></p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b></p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b>, 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 <b>APPROACH</b> used for the study are sound.</p> <p><b>Yes</b>, it is better to be entitled as:  <b>“The impact of different water treatments on survival, growth, and health of ornamental fishes raised under the water condition”</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b>, Abstract contain complete information, structured well with logical flow. Despite, unnecessary words and jargons as I just highlighted on the manuscript.</p> <p><b>Yes</b>,</p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b> the reference section is sufficient with void of few older ones commented in the manuscript..</p>	



<p>references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>		
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Revision with minor comments as commented in the manuscript</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Optional</u></b> comments</p>	<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. 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>	



**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gizachew Delilo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia</b>