



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3686
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Formulating feed for fish by culturing Bloodworms (Chironomus sp.) in different concentrations of Rice Washing Water (RWW) and Fermented Citrus Peel (FCP). Mumbai (Maharashtra)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient</b>	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community because a better diet, as shown by this study, would enable fish to be in good health, grow faster, increase their productivity and boost their immunity. Everyone would like to eat fishes that have been properly reared for good health.  2. The title of the article is suitable and comprehensive.     3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.    4. The structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.  5. The article is scientifically right and will be useful for mankind.  6. The references are sufficient and most are recent.	1. Yes, review comment is absolutely correct.     2. Yes, title is suitable     3. Thank you for your assessment.   4. Will make all changes to make it more appropriate.  5. Thank you for reviewing with generosity.  6. Yes, all references are appropriate and cited according.



<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><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>The English language is appropriate and well formulated.</p>	<p>With due respect, to the reviewer thank you for assessing.</p>
<p><b>Optional</b> comments</p>		

## **PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer' s comment</b></p>	<p><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>
<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>	