

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Name: | UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_UPJOZ_4555 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Mode of action of retinoic acid in the regulation of glucose metabolism in mud crab, <i>Scylla serrata</i> : evidence for the involvement of CHH |
| 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. | The central idea of the manuscript is relevant and would be a valuable contribution to the understanding of hemolymph glucose regulation in crabs under the effect of retinoic acid | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, the title of the article 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 article's summary is comprehensive; however, it would be clearer if there were a sequence that better described how the experiment was designed, rather than going straight to the results.</p> | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>The manuscript is scientifically sound, but there are areas that could be improved. Specifically, the introduction, although clearly structured, could benefit from additional examples involving marine organisms. For example, in the second paragraph, when the authors mention “A possible link between RA and carbohydrate metabolism has been studied in vertebrates”, they only cite the work of Rhee et al., 2013, whereas more recent articles could better support this claim. Furthermore, although the authors suggest investigating interactions with RXR receptors, these are not adequately described in the text and are only briefly mentioned at the end of the introduction without sufficient explanation. Furthermore, the introduction lacks an explicit hypothesis that clearly states what the authors intend to investigate or achieve with the experiment.</p> <p>In the Materials and Methods section, it would be helpful to maintain consistency in terminology, such as using “9-cis-retinoic acid” or “9CRA” throughout the manuscript. Furthermore, it is important to specify the exact number of animals used in each group, if available, and to provide more details on the procedure for eyestalk ablation. In the biochemical analyses, groups 2 and 4 are repeated, which may cause confusion regarding group assignments. Clarifying this would increase the clarity of this section.</p> <p>The discussion section needs further development. Currently, the paragraphs are short and there is a lack</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>of a more in-depth discussion of the phylogenetic analyses. A more complete explanation is needed to clarify how CHH in <i>S. serrata</i> may be closely related to the CHH1 isoform of <i>S. paramamosianus</i>.</p> <p>No, there are no competing interest issues in this manuscript.</p> | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are, for the most part, sufficient and recent, however the addition of articles that address marine vertebrates and invertebrates would give more strength to the arguments. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The quality of the language/English of the article is generally adequate for academic communication. However, some areas may benefit from minor improvements in clarity, consistency and accuracy. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Maria Carolina Lima Farias |
| Department, University & Country | UFS - Federal University of Sergipe, Brazil |