

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_97576
Title of the Manuscript:	Observations of reproductive biology and the gonadal cycle of Gangetic leaf fish Nandus nandus (Hamilton, 1822)
Type of the Article	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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This manuscript is important scientific work given the endangered status of this species. The title is also appropriate (adding of endangered word is suggested) and the observations are comprehensive for getting insights on breeding and spawning of this fish which will be helpful in conservation and captive culturing strategies.</p> <p>The references are also sufficient.</p> <p>The manuscript can be more perfectly put into the proper format as prescribed by journal policy as I have observed some mismatch in citing references similar formatting should be followed throughout the manuscript</p> <p>I have suggested some corrections to improve the content quality and highlighted them in the Manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, after some minor corrections as mentioned in manuscript	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Always write the manuscript in past tense and try to make the sentences more appealing with proper language and avoid jumbling the sentences by inserting many ands in the same sentence</p> <p>In conclusion few points can be added to show the importance of this study to the society in conservation and improving the current status of endangered fish of this particular species</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehraj Ud Din War
Department, University & Country	University of Madras, India