

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4574
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of diversity, diversity indices, and abundance of fish species in Longnit River, Karbi Anglong, Assam, India.
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.	The manuscript addresses an important and understudied aspect of fish diversity in the Longnit River, a region with limited prior research.	This article provides baseline data on the diversity and abundance of fish species present in the scientifically unexplored region of Longnit River, Karbi Anglong. The results, such as dominant families and diversity indices, can be used in conservation strategies and management.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	Thank you for your feedback.

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.	yes	Thank you for your feedback.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is a valuable contribution to regional biodiversity studies, but it requires additional statistical rigor, improved contextualization, and refined presentation to reach its full potential. With these revisions, it is suitable for publication in its current journal.	Thank you for your constructive feedback. Revisions have been made as per suggestions.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The introduction, while informative, lacks critical engagement with recent studies. More recent and regionally specific references could enhance the context.	In response to your comments, the introduction section has been revised and highlighted. However, there is a scarcity of recent studies and regionally specific research focused on the ichthyofauna of the Longnit River and nearby regions. As such, we have relied on broader studies and more general freshwater biodiversity literature.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The introduction, while informative, lacks critical engagement with recent studies.	Thank you for the feedback. There is a scarcity of recent studies and regionally specific research focused on the ichthyofauna of the Longnit River and nearby regions. As such, we have relied on broader studies and more general freshwater
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Minor revisions before publication.	Revisions done and highlighted.

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>	No