

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_106060
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal Abundance and Distribution of Freshwater Snails in Different Beels of Gopalganj District, 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>)

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- The presented study is relevant to improve knowledge in biodiversity of mollusc from Banlgadesh beels.</p> <p>2- The title is suitable and reflects the spirit of the manuscript</p> <p>3- Unfortunately, not, due to English quality</p> <p>4- Yes, nevertheless the quality of English should be improved along the entire manuscript</p> <p>5- Yes</p> <p>6- yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would like to commend the authors for their scientifically sound research and the interesting contributions it offers to our field. I regret to say that I encountered some significant issues with the overall quality of the manuscript. Specifically, the manuscript is marred by substantial problems related to language and writing. The English used in the manuscript is, regrettably, of poor quality, which makes it challenging to comprehend the research and its implications effectively.</p> <p>To ensure that this valuable research receives the attention it deserves, I strongly recommend that the authors seek assistance from a professional language editor or proofreader to improve the clarity and fluency of their writing. Additionally, I suggest that the authors pay particular attention to the structure and organization of the manuscript to enhance its readability</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Koch
Department, University & Country	UNCUYO, Argentina