



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
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
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(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>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient</p>	<p>1. Manuscript is vital for scientific community as it propelling knowledge forward within the scientific realm</p> <p>2. Evaluation and Exploration of Water Quality and Plankton Diversity in Baur Reservoir, Gularbhoj, U.S. Nagar Uttarakhand, India.</p> <p>3. The abstract concisely outlines the study's aims, methodologies, findings, and implications.</p> <p>4. Subsections are little bit different from the guideline. Conclusion part is missing.</p> <p>5. The research is well-done, and what it found is really important for the field and scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The discussion and conclusion need to be</p>	



<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>Minor 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>Optional comments</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:	Arvind Sawane
Department, University & Country	Anand Niketan College, India