

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4578
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the water quality status of Alsand Lake, Dist. Sangli (M.S), India: Ecological conservation and sustainability
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 manuscript is very relevant in view of the increasing pressure on water and water resources and the need to conserve it.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest "Assessment of the water quality status of Alsand Lake, Dist. Sangli (M.S), India for multiple purposes	

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.	The abstract is short. The authors should include the values of the physicochemical parameters recorded in the study and their relationship with the water quality standard like BIS	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes but poorly presented and discussed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are current and sufficient but the citation was poor.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The scientific language need to be improved upon	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study was carried out in four stations and I wonder why the results did not take cognizance of that. No statistical analysis. Other comments are in the reviewed manuscript	

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 <u>ethical issues</u> here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emeka Donald Anyanwu
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria