



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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It generates curiosity on issues/utilization of bloodworm for fish feeding.</b>	1. Yes, I agree with the review comment. And also thank the reviewer for assessing the manuscript.
<b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>2. No. I suggest “ Fish feeding: Utilization of Rice Washing Water (RWW) and Fermented Citrus Peel (FCP) as culture media for Bloodworms (<i>Chironomus spp.</i>)”</b>	2. Ok will make the changes with due respect.
<b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	<b>3. No.</b>	3. With the provided comments I will try my best to overcome all mistakes and change them.
<b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>4. Yes</b>	4. Thank you for assessing.
<b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	<b>5. Yes</b>	5. Yes
<b>6. Are the references sufficient</b>	<b>6. The references are sufficient and many are recent. However, I suggest a referencing style that presents the authors first.</b>	6. Ok, I will note and make the changes appropriately.



<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><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>the grammar construction needs to be enhanced. Furthermore, the use of ambiguous/unscientific vocabularies should be avoided. It is important that components of this study are captured in their appropriate sections (see review comments on the manuscript). Authors should revisit their data calculations (eg: calculation of mean values)</p>	<p>Thank you for reviewing the manuscript with generosity will make the changes soon.</p>
<p><b><u>Optional</u></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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	