

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_119433
Title of the Manuscript:	NEW DISTRIBUTIONAL RECORD OF AN ISOPOD PARASITE <i>Mothocya renardi</i> IN THE HOST <i>Strongylura leiura</i> FROM ARABIAN SEA AROUND NORTHWEST COAST OF GUJARAT, INDIA
Type of the Article	Peer review

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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community</p> <p>The title of the article is not suitable. I will rather suggest : Distribution of <i>Mothocya renardi</i> in <i>Strongylura leiura</i> from Arabian sea in India.</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive and informative. Important elements relating to the title are not described. Kindly follow the instructions for author to write the abstract.</p> <p>The manuscript is not scientific correct</p> <p>The references don't follow the references style of the journal. Few references are old and can be updated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality is not suitable for scholarly communications.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanata Traore
Department, University & Country	Mali