

Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4527
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Electrophoretic Patterns of Protein sub units in various Tissues of Two Fresh Water Fishes (Heteropneustes fossilis and Labeo rohita) through Gel Electrophoresis
Type of the Article	Research article

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 manuscript is designed to compare the electrophoretic mobility of proteins of different organs of two valuable fish species. The study was conceptualized to explain the pesticide-induced deteriorative effects on fish proteins. Since fish have high nutritional importance, the outcome of the study has relevance to the community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable.	

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is not relevant. The information given in the abstract is not proper. The abstract should be restructured with relevant context.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The scientific context of the manuscript is correct, but the introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion are not relevant.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references listed are recent but scattered. Some references are not complete. The complete references are not in the proper format. Reference preparation reflects a lack of concern for scientific referencing.</p>	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of writing is very poor.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The abstract of the manuscript is poorly written.</p> <p>In the introduction, relevancy is lacking. Line- 8, sentence Introduction.....human health, is meaning less.</p> <p>In materials and methods, some sentences are non-conclusive.</p> <p>In result, the gel photographs included are not acceptable.</p> <p>The author must run protein samples of all tissues of one fish in the same gel for the calculation of electrophoretic mobility and photographs of such gel should be submitted.</p> <p>For comparative analysis, protein samples of the same organs of two fish species must be run in the same gel for doing the calculation.</p> <p>The discussion section is inappropriately written and is not related to the context of the study.</p> <p>Similarly, the conclusion does not relate to the context of the study.</p> <p>In my opinion, the manuscript has severe methodological defects.</p>	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shiv Shankar Singh
Department, University & Country	Tripura University, India