

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4557
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient utilization, growth responses of Oreochromis niloticus juveniles fed varying dietary levels of water melon rind waste
Type of the 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.	The research is important as it tries to address a pressing issue regarding production of animal proteins for the increasing human population Its also important to the developing nations as its aimed at providing cost effective aquaculture business. The research also tries to provide alternative and non-conventional feed ingredients in the formulation of fish feeds	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Nutrient utilization and growth responses of <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> juveniles fed varying dietary levels of sun-dried water melon peel waste	DONE
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 needs to be seriously worked on. Implications of some of the high/low values need to be captured. A statement of recommendation needs to be added	DONE
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, to certain extent	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Kindly avoid many old references. Update your references	UPDATE

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but need serious improvement	EDITED
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author needs to be consistence with his/her choice of words “Watermelon was written as water melon in some cases” Be consistence with the scientific name of your tested species “Oreochromis niloticus” and not Tilapia	DONE

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>	