

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4586
Title of the Manuscript:	Food and feedings of <i>Mystus tengara</i> (Hamilton, 1822) from Nagavali River, Andhra Pradesh.
Type of the Article	Manuscript for paper publication

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 present work is very pertinent to explore the habit and habitat of one of the indigenous small but important consumable fish <i>Mystus tengara</i> to sustain their diversity in the natural potential water resources for their conservation as well as propagation to support the growing human population for food and nutrition. The present database may also promote many other research and extension work on other important fish species to upscale aquaculture productivity in the potential water resources for human nutrition and economy enhancement. However, repetition of the work in two consecutive years is required, particularly in the current scenario of climate change. In addition, some photographs of flora and faunal composition in the gut are asking in the manuscript.	Respected Reviewer, thank you very much for your encouragements and insightful comments and suggestions. We initially aimed for two years study but in between some insufficient funds issue was raised, at present we are waiting for funds to complete the work as you suggested. As per your suggestion, in our next article we will fulfil all your insightful comments and will provide clear images to understand the gut composition.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is self- explanatory and justified.	Thank you for your valuable comments.

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.	The abstract is too simple and short. It might have been extensive through brief incorporation of the fish gut composition % enriched with different group population and correlation between different assessing parameters like RLG, GSI and species composition.	Respected reviewer, as per your earlier suggestions, we will do more work on your suggestions with a complete set of analysis we will submit likely two years data in another submission to improve the quality of data and readers understanding.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is written in appropriate format and is scientifically correct.	Thank you for your encouragements.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are moderate enough. However, a few references may be incorporated in the discussion part as citation to strengthen the present work and observation.	Thank you for your suggestions we added few more references in this revised version.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality of writing is satisfactory.	Thank you for your encouragements
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript reveals a demanding work that signifies many facets of aquaculture like improvement of habit, habitat, species conservation and trend of food intake by a carnivorous fish which may act as a model for replication in other small and medium nutritionally important fish to enrich research data . Only some revision as per the comment raised in the 1 st point under importance of the manuscript should be taken into consideration.	Respected reviewer, thank you for your valuable time and review with most appreciable comments, we will do more work on your suggestions with a complete set of analysis we will submit likely two years data in another submission to improve the quality of data and readers understanding.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	