

Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
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

Compulsory 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.	This study's title holds significance for the scientific community, as understanding the impact of heavy metals on living organisms is crucial. Heavy metals pose various health risks to our communities. This research specifically focuses on the effects of lead acetate on living organisms, making it a compelling and important area of study	Thanking you for your appreciation.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable	Thanking you for your appreciation.
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.	Needs a little change, The abstract may include introduction, methodology and results	Yes, it is rephrased accordingly by suggested comments. Thanking you.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it builds on a well-established understanding of the toxicological effects of heavy metals on living organisms. The focus on lead acetate is particularly relevant, addressing a critical environmental and public health concern. However, the research design is not methodologically addressed, raising concerns about the reliability of the collected data. Despite this, the systematic exploration of lead acetate's specific health impacts contributes valuable knowledge to the field and supports further research.	Thanking you for your appreciation. Yes, it is rephrased accordingly by suggested comments in the manuscript.

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No Some articles are old The reference is not crossreff or not automatic, The reference may use mendeley software or other	Yes, it is rephrased accordingly by suggested comments. We (authors) could be incorporated very recent references sufficiently. Thanking you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Partly	We (authors) could be restructured entire manuscript neatly by the reviewer comments. Thanking you for your appreciation.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The method should be written clearly and write the necessary steps	Yes, it is rephrased accordingly by suggested comments in the methodological part. Thanking you.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	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. 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. 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.
--	--	---