

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_95576
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Water Quality in the Major Nursery Grounds of Hilsa Insights from Plankton and Nutrient Regimes
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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)	Yes, it is important for scientific community as it reveals biological data. This also constitute significant understanding to the study area. However, I found no standard level of the physico-chemical parameters. This will show if the data you gathered is within the set limits or beyond. Yes. Yes, the abstract is well written. No, Indicate what plankton found the greatest number in Station 1 and 4. Generally, what species also has dominated the River. It is necessary to be specific. Yes, it is scientifically correct. But as a reviewer and conducted the same study. Yes. As a reviewer, I would like to as why did you not include the Dissolve Oxygen?	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes,	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cresencio C Cabuga
Department, University & Country	Del Pilar National High School, Philippines