

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_90868
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution, Biology and Ontogeny of Indian River Shad (<i>Tenualosa ilisha</i>)
Type of the Article	Review

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript discusses the distribution, biology, and development of Indian River Shad, <i>Tenualosa ilisha</i>. Before it can be accepted for publication, the manuscript needs a complete revision. There are several places where the language is poor and difficult to understand. Neither the introduction provides a good state of the art nor does it adequately argue the rationale for the work, nor does it clearly state what the work aims to achieve and which questions drive the research. There needs to be more detail in the abstract section about the data used, especially regarding past averages. The remaining is a mixture of others results. There is no good quality in the figures, the author could include artwork or figures instead of old scans, this section should also be completely revised. Hilsa fisheries would greatly benefit from gathering knowledge if it's clear. Use Hilsa/hilsa or <i>T. ilisha</i> any one in the entire manuscript. Check the superscript In reference section check the scientific names in italics Check entire manuscript</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Therefore, it is up to the editorial team to decide whether the manuscript is acceptable or not after all corrections.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Swagat Ghosh
Department, University & Country	RKMVERI, India