

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.	This article could have provided a scientific report on the overall fish species in Longnit River, Karbi Anglong, Assam, India, which would help conserve fish biodiversity.	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)	No	Thank you for your feedback. The title has been changed and highlighted in the manuscript. Please let us know if further refinements are required. Thank you.

<p>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.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback on the abstract. Revisions have been made in the abstract to make it more comprehensive and highlighted in the manuscript.</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The author/s doesn't follow any guidelines like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors used very old data like 2020. In the case of diversity, several factors can change it. Why, they want to publish this in 2025? 2. The title must be changed. 3. Abstract doesn't reflect the outcome or objectives of the study. 4. Introduction section is very poor , research gap, aims and objectives, why they did the work is not clear or absent. 5. Materials and methods section is very poor. 6. Incase of result, authors repeat the table data within text.. 7. Where is discussion section?? 8. Conclusion is very poor. 	<p>Response to #1. Thank you for your comment. We acknowledge the time gap between data collection and the publication of this study. I would like to mention that the delay in publication was due to several challenges, including extensive data validation and manuscript revisions. Furthermore, constraints, such as limited accessibility to field sites for follow-up studies and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, contributed to the extended timeline. Despite these challenges, the study remains a crucial contribution to understanding the ichthyofaunal diversity of the Longnit River and provides a necessary baseline for future comparative assessments and conservation efforts.</p> <p>Response to #2. The title has been changed and highlighted in the manuscript. Please let us know if further refinements are required. Thank you.</p> <p>Response to #3. Revisions have been made in the abstract to make it more comprehensive and highlighted in the manuscript.</p> <p>Response to #4. In response to your comments, the introduction section has been revised to clearly outline the research gap, the aims and objectives of the study, and the rationale behind the work and it has been highlighted.</p> <p>Response to #5. The materials and methods section has been</p>

		<p>revised and highlighted in the original manuscript.</p> <p>Response to #6. The repetitions have been omitted as per suggestions.</p> <p>Response to #7. A discussion section has been added and highlighted.</p> <p>Response to #8. The conclusion has been revised and highlighted.</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No	Thank you for your comment. In response, additional references have been added where suitable to ensure the manuscript is up-to-date and adequately supported by recent literature.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Very poor	Thank you for your valuable feedback. The manuscript has been thoroughly revised to improve the quality.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	No