

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_115182
Title of the Manuscript:	Profiling of sediments from brackish water shrimp ponds in Navsari, Gujarat
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>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 – Yes, I consider the manuscript extremely important, as it addresses important aspects of how our decision to choose the most appropriate management, as well as the initial characteristics of our soil, can reflect negatively or positively on aquaculture activity. And in addition, soil and water quality is the first management activity we have to perform prior to settlement. I see it as important also because it addresses where the animal will be grown and not the animal itself.</p> <p>2 – Yes, it is adequate, it explains in a clear and concise way the approach of the manuscript.</p> <p>3 – Yes, comprehensive, explanatory and easy to understand.</p> <p>4 – They are appropriate, I was just curious to have this data cross-referenced with when the lagoon is dry, it would be interesting to compare if the humidity results in differences.</p> <p>5 – Scientifically correct, based on observations and comparisons, there are experiences with bibliographic references.</p> <p>6 – To say that they are enough, they never are, but they are necessary.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript has good linguistic/English interpretation, and will not generate academic communicative misunderstandings.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Euclides Pereira e Silva
Department, University & Country	Federal Institute of Pará, Brazil