

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_96459
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Genetic Diversity of Mobula sp. in Cilacap Using RAPD (Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA) Markers
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript represents a good contribution towards status of species belonging to Mobula genus. Following the methodological approach and analyses the authors are clearly stating the conclusion that "... average similarity index indicates that the genetic diversity of the Mobula species is moderate".</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</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>	<p>The manuscript represents a good contribution towards status of species belonging to Mobula genus. Following the methodological approach and analyses the authors are clearly stating the conclusion that "... average similarity index indicates that the genetic diversity of the Mobula species is moderate".</p> <p>Some improvements are needed.</p> <p>The manuscript needs further improvements particularly in species writing (italic style, and genus large letter, species small letter...).</p> <p>In the Section 2.1.2 DNA Amplification it is stated that: "DNA amplification was carried out by [26] method. The primer used was OPE-01 (CCCAAGGTCC)." In order that the manuscript serves better for further studies, please explain a bit with paragraph what is the essence of approach and how primers were secured (reference).</p> <p>In a vast use of molecular techniques, the authors need to explain the lacking or survey limitations (limited number of specimens,....)</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Spase Shumka
Department, University & Country	Agricultural University of Tirana, Albania