

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_96554
Title of the Manuscript:	Skewed sex ratio induced imperilment of Himalayan golden mahseer Tor putitora: a bottleneck for captive propagation
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 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)	1.The manuscript is important to the community. It addresses the issue of the mass production of fish fry in support of the development of fish farming and the conservation of fish species. 2. The title proposed by the author does not seem appropriate. He could have said Imbalance of the sex ratio in Golden mahseer Tor putitora in favor of females in support of the development of his breeding and his conservation in situ 3. Yes 4. No. 5. No. We propose a better structured manuscript by adopting the following plan: Introduction, Methodological approach, Results and Discussions, Conclusions, Bibliographical references, Appendix. The proposed manuscript lacks chapters such as Methodological Approach, Results and Discussions, Conclusion 6.It's Ok	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications is correct	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript can be accepted after taking into account comments on missing elements. Specify how this experience was made: the amount of estradiol incorporated into the food and how many times the food was provided. Also specify the density without forgetting the environmental parameters that surrounded this study. The methodology used in this study must be explained for completeness	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamet Diaw Diadiou
Department, University & Country	Sénégal