

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_105795
Title of the Manuscript:	The Fecundity, Total Length, Body Weight, and Gonadal Length-Weight Relationships of Hilsa Shad (Tenualosa ilisha) in Bangladesh
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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community, Yes, an important paper for the scientific community, but needs a lot more information</p> <p>Title : Acceptable Abstract : Abstract should present introduction, purpose, methods, results and conclusions Introduction : Before the purpose, state the previous studies conducted by other people or same authors for other biota and or same biota Methodology : Acceptable, but must be add more Results and Discussions : discussion is missing and unclear, Compare to other previous studies have been conducted by other researchers or same researcher, in other organism or same organism</p> <p>Yes, this manuscript is scientifically correct but unclear</p> <p>The formatting does not respect the Journals requirements. Please see the model on our website and make the necessary adjustments." please add more references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>sufficient, but needs to be improved</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adam Robisalmi
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Fishery, Indonesia