

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_116854
Title of the Manuscript:	Fish biodiversity and Socio economic aspects of Transboundary River Someshwari in netrokona, Bangladesh
Type of the Article	

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.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/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>1. Yes</p> <p>2. No (Socioeconomic data is not present in the manuscript)</p> <p>3. Grammatical mistakes and spelling mistakes are found in the abstract</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>a) Time period of the sample collection should be used in the "Data Collection" section, not in the study area section.</p> <p>b) Use the latitude and longitude of the study area.</p> <p>c) Ethical consideration is not mentioned in the manuscript. It should be mentioned when the fishes were preserved in 10% formalin.</p> <p>d) In the Materials and method section statistical analysis was mentioned but no statistically significant (p<0.05) result was found in the manuscript.</p> <p>e) Figure 3 is not appropriate labelled.</p> <p>5. Use some current references after 2022</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Moderate English language. Spelling mistakes and grammatical mistakes are frequent.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Elaborate the methodology section. Why only 100 fishermen were chosen for survey is not clear. Add a supplementary file of the questionnaires, if possible.</p> <p>2. Fresh pictures of the fish species in the manuscript will be highly appreciated.</p> <p>3. Making excel graphs is not under statistical analysis, the name of the specific statistical test and its requirement should be maintained properly in the methodology and there should be a valid significant output of the interpreted data.</p> <p>4. Title needs to revise.</p> <p>5. Abbreviation "FAO" is mentioned in the manuscript but the full form (Food and Agriculture Organisation) is not mentioned.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Surajit Majumder
Department, University & Country	Bankura Sammilani College, Bankura University, India