

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4009
Title of the Manuscript:	Lipid peroxidation and antioxidant effects of Lead acetate: An experiment in various organs of Oreochromis mossambicus (Peters 1852)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is significant as it addresses concerns about aquatic toxicology, particularly the impact of herbicides on non-target species. Understanding lipid peroxidation and antioxidant defense systems in fish adds to the growing body of knowledge on environmental pollutants and their biological effects. I appreciate the study for its relevance to ecological health and conservation efforts.	Thanking you for your appreciation.

Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Lipid peroxidation and antioxidant effects of Lead acetate: An experiment in various organs of Oreochromis mossambicus," is appropriate. It clearly reflects the study's focus on biochemical responses to herbicide exposure in a fish species.	We (authors) followed as it is. Thanking you for your appreciation and scientific comments.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from some clarification. the conclusion could be expanded to more clearly state the implications of the findings for environmental monitoring and fish health.	Thanking you for your appreciation. Yes, it is rephrased accordingly by suggested comments.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is appropriate. The sections are logically organized, with a clear flow from introduction to methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion.	Thanking you for your appreciation.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The authors conducted appropriate biochemical assays to measure lipid peroxidation and antioxidant activity. The statistical analyses are thorough, supporting the validity of the conclusions drawn. The study addresses a significant issue in ecotoxicology, making it a valuable contribution to the field. The use of control groups and appropriate experimental design enhances the manuscript's credibility.	Thanking you for your appreciation.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and fairly recent. The cited literature adequately supports the background and interpretation of the results. However, I recommend the inclusion of a few more recent studies on oxidative stress markers in aquatic organisms exposed to pollutants, particularly those published within the last five years, to reflect the current state of research.	Thanking you for your appreciation. Yes, it is rephrased accordingly by suggested comments. We (authors) could be incorporated very recent references sufficiently. Thanking you.

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication.	Thanking you for your appreciation.
Optional/General comments	The study is well-conducted and addresses an important topic in aquatic toxicology. A stronger emphasis on the practical applications of the findings, such as implications for environmental policy and conservation efforts, would further increase its impact.	Thanking you for your appreciation.

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>	<p>No suggestion has risen by authors side, we followed neatly and the said comments has been neatly as well as sufficiently incorporated in the entire manuscript.</p> <p>We are using the very familiar/ common faunal model for metal analysis under laboratory condition only. It there is no under IUCN threaten category. Thanking you.</p> <p>Very glade to inform you that, thank you so much for your patience, critical analysis, novelty of comments and meticulous suggestion. Really your comments and suggestion improved the manuscript with global standard and scientific excellence of this MS.</p>