

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_114742
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Fish Biodiversity of Tawarja Reservoir, Latur, Maharashtra (India)
Type of the Article	

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This study holds promise for benefiting the local community by providing valuable insights into the ichthyofaunal diversity of Tawarja reservoir. Based on a quick survey using google scholar, there is limited information regarding the fish biodiversity in this reservoir. The findings offer a foundation for informed management strategies aimed at conserving the reservoir's biodiversity while supporting the sustainable use of its resources by local residents.</li> <li>2. The title is quite crude and not interesting enough.</li> <li>3. The abstract was not well written. There are several grammatical errors and awkward phrases in the abstract that could be revised for clarity and readability. For example, "weather" should be "whether," and "allowted" should be "allocated." Proofreading for grammar and syntax would improve the overall quality of the abstract. The method used for this study was not mentioned.</li> <li>4. The subsections are appropriate. However, the introduction was poorly written.</li> <li>5. The manuscript requires proofreading, as some sentences are difficult to understand.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Major revision	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	This manuscript should not be considered for publication in this journal	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohd Ilman Bin Che Abdullah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kolej Mara Kulim, Malaysia</b>