

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_104544
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Fecundity and GSI of Pahari Gutum, Somileptes Gongota (Hamilton, 1822) From the Padma River in Rajshahi District, Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it may be as economy and many people food nature depends upon the fish and its growth.</p> <p>Estimation of Fecundity and GSI of Pahari Gutum, Somileptes Gongota (Hamilton, 1822) From the Padma River in Rajshahi District, Bangladesh (yellow mark must be removed)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Lack of some technical term & methods</p> <p>There is lack in references 2010 to 2020, suggest to add it</p> <p>Introduction too lengthy while Discussion part very poor, need to apply more facts and output. Advised to pay attention as no references of correlated of the study has been given in this part, suggest to add.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Lack of concentration during data adding in table dated 10/06/2019 while table can be made in consolidated way to showing the whole data in single sheet. Advised to read research papers before writing the articles and tabulation part also need to improve to concise the article page numbers.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rekha Rani
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, India