

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_98522
Title of the Manuscript:	Fish skin mucus and its importance in fish and humans
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Fish skin mucus plays many important functions as a stable barrier against harmful pathogens, Several findings in this regard reveal its importance to fishes and human and so it is important to scientific community. Yes  Content of the abstract is not sufficient.  No adequate and appropriate subsections related to the title are given in the manuscript.  Poor information except that of the table and no explanation is given in the manuscript and so it is not correct.  Only limited references of recent literatures are given in the manuscript and no standard format of reference as per the journal is followed, which reveals careless compilation of the manuscript.  Introduction is so lengthy and objective of the paper is not mentioned in it. Only bullet points are given regarding the function and role of fish skin mucus. Review information is presented in Table 1; and it is not duly explained in the manuscript. Conclusion is once again summarising the bullet points. As a whole, this manuscript is not suitable for publication at this stage in this journal.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Language quality is not suitable at this stage.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ravi Velayutham
Department, University & Country	Periyar Arts College, Annamalai University, India