

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_127651
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Microplastics in Fishes of Hooghly River, India.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	In the current scenario of microplastic pollution of water bodies all over the world, this work provides an excellent knowledge about the damages caused by these microplastics in fish body. Moreover, it throws light on the hazardous side of these microplastics reaching the human body via these food fishes. Hence this work is relevant in the current scenario to the scientific community	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Effect of microplastics on the gill structure of certain fishes collected from Hooghly River, West Bengal	
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.	Rewrite the abstract after manuscript modification	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but requires major revision	
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.	There is no uniformity in the format of the references given. In some there is no year of publication whereas in majority, page nos are not mentioned. Even et al., is mentioned in the reference section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Mention the taxonomic key used in the identification of fishes2. Include a pictorial plate containing the fishes collected3. Include the microscope photographs of different types of microplastics collected from the water bodies as well as from the body of the fishes4. SEM, Raman spectroscopy, FTIR Studies on microplastics must be included for the authenticity of the work.5. Mention the fishes from which the gills were taken for histological studies in the figures provided in the results section.6. Compare the normal gill structure of the fish taken for the study with the ones whose gill structure has been altered due to microplastics.7. No picture of gut ulcers caused by these microplastics. Only very vague explanation.8. Better English may be used. Avoid "&" symbols, instead write "and".9. There is no uniformity in the format of the references given. In some there is no year of publication whereas in majority, page nos are not mentioned. Even et al., is mentioned in the reference section.	

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:	Adhira M Nayar
Department, University & Country	Mahatma Gandhi College Thiruvananthapuram, India