

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4574
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of diversity, diversity indices, and abundance of fish species in Longnit River, Karbi Anglong, Assam, India.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.	This article could have provided a scientific report on the overall fish species in Longnit River, Karbi Anglong, Assam, India, which would help conserve fish biodiversity.	

Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No	
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.	No	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The author/s doesn't follow any guidelines like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors used very old data like 2020. In the case of diversity, several factors can change it. Why, they want to publish this in 2025? 2. The title must be changed. 3. Abstract doesn't reflect the outcome or objectives of the study. 4. Introduction section is very poor , research gap, aims and objectives, why they did the work is not clear or absent. 5. Materials and methods section is very poor. 6. Incase of result, authors repeat the table data within text.. 7. Where is discussion section?? 8. Conclusion is very poor. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Very poor	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Md. Aslam Khan
Department, University & Country	University Of Rajshahi, Bangladesh