

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_97639
Title of the Manuscript:	Catch of <i>Otolithes ruber</i> (Bloch & Schneider, 1801) of Small-scale fisherfolks in San Miguel Bay, Philippines
Type of the Article	

### 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>For local consumption, it is yes. For the journal the data was obsolete and it was not worth publishing because the fishery is dynamic (There is a lot happening within five years' time).</p> <p><b>Not (Fisheries and biology of <i>Otolithes ruber</i> (Bloch &amp; Schneider, 1801) of Small-scale fisherfolk in San Miguel Bay, Philippines)</b></p> <p><b>Not</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>All the references are outdated</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	More or less	
<p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The title is not considered the objective of the biology part</p> <p>Introduction information was fully obsolete (More than 40 years)</p> <p>Lack of standard procedure in materials and methods</p> <p>Misplaced section (materials and methods in result, discussion in result ....)</p> <p>Discussion not discussed authors' result</p> <p>Conclusion completely out of the MS</p>	

Comment [H1]: Your title is not considered your objective of the biology part

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Belay Abdissa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Amhara Agriculture Research Institute, Ethiopia</b>