

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_105360
Title of the Manuscript:	First record of the Glugea sp. on the Alosa fallax (Lacepède, 1803) caught in the marine waters of Syria(eastern Mediterranean).
Type of the Article	Review 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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. Yes. 6. Yes.</p> <p>I recommend redoing the references in the text according to the guidelines for authors: References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. I also recommend redoing the list, for example: Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. See: https://peerreviewcentral.com/index.php?page/general-guideline-for-authors</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I point out in the text a few corrections (with "Change Control" mode).</p> <p>In Sec. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS: The presence of fatty tumors on the viscera (Stomach and Intestines, as well as some tumors within the muscles), Figure (2). The presence of fatty tumors in the viscera (stomach and intestines) was recorded, as well as some tumors within the muscles (Figure 2).</p> <p>In Sec. CONCLUSIONS: The results showed that Alosa fallax was infected with the parasite Glugea sp. The results showed that one of the individuals of <i>Alosa fallax</i> analyzed was infected with the parasite <i>Glugea</i> sp.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Consider including a map with the location of the study area</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Guillermo Martín Caille
Department, University & Country	National University of Patagonia San Juan Bosco, Argentina