

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125520
Title of the Manuscript:	Preliminary analysis of the feeding habits of two species of the genera Mobula (Mobula japanica and Mobula tarapacana) in the coastal waters of Côte d'Ivoire, Gulf of Guinea
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study of fish diet is very important to know their biology. The species studied by the authors are interesting and give originality to the work, which can serve as references for future studies. Despite the comments recorded on the quality of the manuscript, it remains interesting to publish and share with the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs some modifications The country 'Ivory Coast' must appear in English, and the species references must be added	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Keywords need to be modified. The names of the species (genus and species) and the exact study area must appear among the key words	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The discussion must contain subtitles, for better organization of the text. The same subtitles in "Results" must appear in "Discussion" section	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is interesting given its originality in the study area, and the sampling duration which extended between 2020 and 2022. However, the sampled population is small, especially with the high values of the index of stomach emptiness (there is little stomach content left to analyze), and the lack and/or absence of the statistical comparisons necessary to confirm or refute the differences between sexes, seasons and species.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Vacuity index must be compared with other studies, for each species separately.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English needs improvement, from the beginning to the end of the manuscript	
Optional/General comments	A similarity between the summary and the conclusion was observed. Avoid talking about the methodology followed in the conclusion. Authors can start the conclusion like that: Through this study, we obtained original results concerning the diet of the species studied. ...ec.	

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:	Rima Mohdeb
Department, University & Country	University of Jijel, Algeria