

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_90126
Title of the Manuscript:	First Occurrence of <i>Heniochus intermedius</i> Steindachner, 1893 in The Syrian marine waters (Levantine basin)
Type of the Article	Short communication

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>This study reported a new locality of <i>Heniochus intermedius</i> in Syria. In addition, they have analysed morphometric characters to confirm the species. Reporting these types of unusual citing of the animals is important for further conservation and management plans. The topic of the study is needed to be revised in an attractive way and the content of the article is relevant and of general interest to the readers of the journal. However, I felt that the paper is an overall well in approach including the data representation. However, On the other hand, I found the writing style of this manuscript is well, however, I would recommend checking the manuscript in the English language with a native speaker.</p> <p>Further, I have little confidence in some details arrangements and came away with of few questions to be able to recommend this paper for publication as it stands. Therefore, I recommend that a Minor revision be warranted. I explain my concerns in more detail below. I ask that the authors specifically address each of my comments in their responses.</p> <p>Major comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have several concerns about the introduction. It is better if the authors can provide a clear comprehensive introduction to the natural history of the animal migration as some reports have been mentioned that this species came to the Mediterranean via turkey's Gulf of Antalya. Therefore, please provide more supportive data for this. 2. In the materials and method section, The arrangement is good and the authors provided clear information. However, in the methods, it is enough to provide a way of analysing the species without mentioning the story of finding the specimen. Hence, briefly explaining that fishermen caught this at that particular location etc not required a full story. 3. Results and discussion section arrangement also in well manner. But I would like to suggest to the author please provide morphometric data in a tabulated way for particular specimens from the previous studies. Therefore, please try to make a solid discussion in order to provide clear justification. 4. In the abstract and conclusion, the abstract is well in format however, the abstract and conclusion should be included according to the topic of the paper after revising the suggestions and comments. 	
Minor REVISION comments	1. N/A	
Optional/General comments	Please recheck the authors guidelines provided by journal and try to rearrange whole manuscript according to the suggestions provided and check about the language errors again.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	H. K. S. De Zoysa
Department, University & Country	Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka