



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
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, I believe this research is great and important for the scientific community as it emphasizes the importance of using a water filtration system for the promotion of better health quality of cultured fish, although some of the results show that there were alterations in fish even with the water filtration</p> <p>I have re-casted it to: Investigation on the effects of different water treatments on the growth, and health of ornamental fishes raised under freshwater culture conditions</p> <p>Author needs to re-cast some sentences and include very briefly the methodology in the abstract.</p> <p>Yes but there should be a discussion section. From the result, it shows that fish with the water treatment also had histopathological alterations as the ones without water filtration. This should be clearly discussed stating reason and should compare it to other researches. The discussion section can also be merged with the conclusion.</p>	



<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes Author should confirm if all listed references are in the main body. I randomly choose some references and couldn't find them in the main body. I didn't check for all references.</p>	
--	---	--



<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>The author needs to make major revisions, I made some comments in the manuscript. Generally, I found it difficult to understand the methodology. The Author exposed 3 species of fish, but was the 1st species kept in T1, 2nd species in T2, 3rd species in T3? If so, it should be stated in the methodology. how may fish per species were taken out every 15 days? The methodology and results need to be better presented.</p>	
<p>Optional comments</p>	<p>Example: page 5 talks about Table 1, but Table 1 is seen on page 8. Histology result is on page 6 but Figures (which should be changed to Plates) are on page 10. Some sentences need to be re-casted.</p> <p>Most comments are in the manuscript (track-changed)</p>	



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:	Joy Onwude
Department, University & Country	Canada