

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4534
Title of the Manuscript:	The Fiddler Crab of the Sundarbans: A Call for Conservation
Type of the Article	Minireview 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In the context of today's widely altered weather patterns, climate change had a major contribution affecting the sustained productivity of the ecological services. In this context, the Sundarbans and their bio-diversified species of our country pave a notable way forward in regulating our climatic parameters. Therefore, the manuscript has an absolute suitability for its consideration.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Absolutely	

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 absolutely perfect according to its contained sections and contains the presumptive snapshot of the entire article correctly.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Exactly, in every aspect of its points of information concentrating on – i. crab's scientific name and their ecological significance, ii. anthropogenic threats, and iii. conservation measures, except a very minor discrepancy in the biodiversity statistics, i.e., number of fishes in the 'intricate network of tidal rivers and creeks', whose relevant corrective data can be cited from the most recent paper of "Zaman, M. S., & Chowdhury, T. H. (2024). The Sundarbans, the World's Largest Tidal Halophytic Mangrove Forest: Its Economic and Ecological Significance, <i>Bangla J. Interdisciplinary Sci.</i> , 2 (1): E1-E15"	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Exactly sufficient. Recent also.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Absolutely.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Urna Banerjee
Department, University & Country	India