

Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4584
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphology and Molecular Taxonomic studies of Marine Sponges of Lakshadweep
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.	This manuscript provides new insights into the sponge diversity of the Lakshadweep region, contributing valuable taxonomic records and expanding our understanding of marine biodiversity. The discovery of a new species and several new regional records highlights the importance of continued exploration and documentation in understudied marine environments. These findings can aid future ecological and conservation efforts, particularly in protecting sponge habitats and understanding their role in marine ecosystems. Additionally, the molecular taxonomy data contribute to a more precise classification and evolutionary understanding of these species	Corrected as per Reviewer comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Morphology and Molecular Taxonomic Studies of Marine Sponges of Lakshadweep," is clear but could be refined for better clarity and impact.	Corrected

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.	Abstract should have a clear structure: background, objective, methods, results, and conclusion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an inconsistency in the number of species reported: • The first sentence mentions 43 species recorded from two surveys. • The following paragraph states 45 species were found. • It should be clarified whether the number is 43 or 45 species. 	Corrected number of species
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	To assess whether the manuscript is scientifically correct, a detailed review of its content, methodology, data analysis, and conclusions would be necessary.	Not necessary
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		Corrected and added more references as per reviewer comments
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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