

Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4598
Title of the Manuscript:	Reproductive biology of under threatened fish species Ompak bimaculatus (Bloch 1794) from Vamsadhara River, Andhra Pradesh.
Type of the Article	Research

**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.	Standardized knowledge on factors like size at maturity, spawning, sex-ratio, ova diameter studies and fecundity are essential pre-requisites in fishery management and conservation For understanding the dynamics of the gonads and to assess reproductive performance of species information of the phase of gonad development is virtually important	Thank you for your valuable review and comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	

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.	yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There is no conclusion paragraph in the manuscript. The author should add one.	Thank you for your valuable review and comments. We mentioned in this revised version.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>The information in this article is important. However, it would have been preferable to present the results of the development of the relative weight of the gonads (or what is called RGS) in the form of a graph to facilitate a better understanding of the results</b></p> <p><b>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</b></p>	Thank you for your valuable review and comments. We mentioned in this revised version.

## **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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	