

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	

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.	Indigenous fishes like <i>Mystus tengara</i> are going to be abolished due to the bulk culture of exotic fishes. Small fishes like this fish possess high nutritive value.	Respected Reviewer, thank you very much for valuable review and insightful comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title is suitable.	Thank you for valuable review.

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.	Minor changes are required. Red highlighted areas of the sentences should be corrected.	Thank you for corrections, as per your valuable suggestions, rectified the mistakes.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. Scientifically correct. But in Table. 1, there may be some mathematical error. The errors are highlighted in red colour. After checking, the corrected values are given there and highlighted in green colour.	Thank you for encouragements and apologies for the mistakes occurred and thank you very much for corrections incorporated for us.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but one reference is missing . Das and Moitra (1963) is mentioned in the manuscript but in reference section the details are missing.	Apologies for the mistake, incorporated in revised version.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor changes are required. I made some suggestions in the manuscript.	Respected Reviewer, thank you very much for valuable review and valuable insights.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Reviewed and checked the manuscript carefully and highlighted the incorrect spellings and sentences. The manuscript could be published after error free typing and proper correction.	Respected Reviewer, thank you very much for valuable review and valuable insights.

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>	