



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3641
Title of the Manuscript:	AN ASSESSMENT OF WATER QUALITY AND PLANKTON DIVERSITY IN BAUR RESERVOIR GULARBHOJ, U.S NAGAR UTTARAKHAND (INDIA)
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
<b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b>		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b>  (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	1. Manuscript is vital for scientific community as it propelling knowledge forward within the scientific realm	Noted
<b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  (If not please suggest an alternative title)	2. Evaluation and Exploration of Water Quality and Plankton Diversity in Baur Reservoir, Gularbhoj, U.S. Nagar Uttarakhand, India.	Okay
<b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	3. The abstract concisely outlines the study's aims, methodologies, findings, and implications.	Done
<b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	4. Subsections are little bit different from the guideline. <b>Conclusion part is missing.</b>	Added
<b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	5. The research is well-done, and what it found is really important for the field and scientifically correct.	Done
<b>6. Are the references sufficient</b>	6. The discussion and conclusion need to be	Okay



<p>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>supported with recent references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Figure 1: Full forms of abbreviations are not given. Conclusion part is missing, discussion should be supported with the recent references</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>Optional</b> comments</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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	