

Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4578
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the water quality status of Alsand Lake, Dist. Sangli (M.S), India: Ecological conservation and sustainability
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>
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is very relevant in view of the increasing pressure on water and water resources and the need to conserve it.	Nil
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	I suggest "Assessment of the water quality status of Alsand Lake, Dist. Sangli (M.S), India for multiple purposes	We appreciate your suggestion. We decided to rearrange title which relevant to manuscript.

<b>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.</b>	The abstract is short. The authors should include the values of the physicochemical parameters recorded in the study and their relationship with the water quality standard like BIS	Regarding your suggestion we make few changes according to your suggestion. But we decided to keep abstract concise because addition of recorded value and BIS values makes abstract lengthy. So we decided to add BIS standards column in table.1, which is highlighted.
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes but poorly presented and discussed.	According to your suggestion we make changes in result and discussion. We rephrase the few sentences and adding relevant discussion of the result.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are current and sufficient but the citation was poor.	According to your suggestion we remove unused references and references that you have suggested.
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The scientific language need to be improved upon	According your suggestion we trying to match your expectation.
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>	The study was carried out in four stations and I wonder why the results did not take cognizance of that. No statistical analysis. Other comments are in the reviewed manuscript	In this case, we choose to calculate the mean standard deviation of the parameters for every location and month. Here, we display the lake's results seasonally by taking the mean standard deviation of all four sites.

## **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	Nil