

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4571
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATION OF PHYSIOCHEMICAL PARAMETERS AND ITS POLLUTION IMPLICATIONS IN THENPENNAI RIVER, CUDDALORE, TAMIL NADU.
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: 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.	<p>a) The manuscript highlighted the physicochemical parameters in Thenpennai river</p> <p>b) Environmental pollutional status was studied in this paper</p> <p>c) The paper was studied for household waste and effluents dumping around the river</p> <p>d) T test result indicated non biodegradable waste was the</p>	

	main cause of pollution	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	a) Add your main objectives in the abstract b) Add minimum 5 keywords in keywords points without your paper title	a) The main objective of this study is to assess the water quality and to screen the amount of domestic wastes present in the river which is the major cause of water pollution and is added in the corrected manuscript. b) Ecotoxicology, Anthropogenic, Physiochemical parameters, Eutrophication, Riverine pollution.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. Some minor revision must be needed . This revision I tell the following in optional points	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	a) References should be APA format. All of the references should be followed same format. b) Some references format are wrong, check it, specially reference no 3	a) All the references are checked and changed to APA format. b) I have checked and changed the reference no 3 to APA format.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	

Optional/General comments	<p>a) More current references should be added in the introduction section</p> <p>b) Mention the source and end point along with previous study (if any) of river</p> <p>c) Give exact map of your study area in materials method points</p> <p>d) Write elaborately how you take, collect and measure your sample</p> <p>e) Add water temperature parameters in your paper</p> <p>f) Add the references for optimum value for biodegradable and non biodegradable waste</p> <p>g) Conclusion should be compact and add some key points of your results in conclusion. Remove unnecessary writing in conclusion section.</p>	<p>a) Current studies and their references are added in the introduction.</p> <p>b) There are no much previous studies related to thenpennai lake.</p> <p>c) The exact location of the study are been added along with the map.</p> <p>d) The materials used for collection of samples are mentioned in the materials and methods. And also references for measuring the physio chemical parameters are added.</p> <p>e) Further research has to be extended on this site. Temperature parameters will be studied in future research.</p> <p>f) As of now there is no remarkable value for the biodegradable and non-biodegradable waste.</p> <p>g) The conclusion has made compacted and highlights the major point of our results.</p>
----------------------------------	--	--

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>	