

0Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_5588
Title of the Manuscript:	Poecilobdella kananbalaee A New Species of Leech from Karnataka, India
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author's Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 is the first time reporting of a species of leech. Will definitely add to the existing database. Photographs are elaborate for future comparative work.	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	Noted

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.	Few more keywords (specially related with this species) can be added.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few details regarding how the specimens were collected may be added. • How are the specimens' surface sterilised, please add particulars. • In abstract it is written that 'This research will establish a new leech species, <i>Poecilobdella kananbalaae</i>, which was collected from Ulsoor lake in Bangalore, Karnataka, India.' And in page no.2 for describing Plate no. 1 & 2 it is written 'These leeches collected from Kerala'. Also it is mentioned 'DISTRIBUTION: India: Karnataka' Please make this clear. Also there should be 'were' after leeches in this line. 	Done
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are recent.	Noted

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In page no. 2 ‘sorted’ can be replaced by ‘categorised’. • In page no.2 line no.19 there should be no comma before and. • In page no.3 line no. 01, cutted is wrong English. Can be replaced with ‘ freshly cut’ or ‘cut’. • In page no. 3 line no. 2, : can be replaced with ‘ • In page no.3 line no. 3 concists should be replaced with ‘consist .’ • In page no.3 ‘From 12 segment to 25th each segment consists of 4 annuli in each segment’can be replaced by ‘From 12th to 25th segment, each segment consists of 4 annuli’ • In page 3 line no.10 it should be ‘large’ • In page no. 5 no ‘,’ should be there before ‘and’ • In page no.6 line no. 7 genus name should be in italics. • In page no. 6 line no. 7 ‘published’ can be replaced by ‘reported’ • In page no.6 , under CONCLUSION ‘ cutted’ needs to be replaced by ‘cut’ • Under CONCLUSION again ‘From 12 segment to 25th each segment consists of 4 annuli in each segment.’ can be replaced by ‘From 12th to 25th segment, each segment consists of 4 annuli’ • In the title, please add a : after new sp name. 	<p>Revision done</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	