

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125110
Title of the Manuscript:	ADDITIONAL REPORT AND TAXONOMIC DESCRIPTION OF COMMON PIKE CONGER MURAENESOX BAGIO FROM DHOLAI FISHING HARBOUR, GUJARAT, NORTHWEST COAST OF INDIA
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The study is of significant contributions for workers or researches of Fisheries especially classical taxonomist. The overall writing skill is little poor, but the manuscript is of relevance in terms of Fisheries. I liked this manuscript, but few changes needed. Writing should be improved in respect of Scientific name, spelling, references, citations etc.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>NO ADDITIONAL REPORT AND TAXONOMIC DESCRIPTION OF COMMON PIKE CONGER <i>MURAENESOX BAGIO</i> (HAMILTON, 1822) FROM DHOLAI FISHING HARBOUR, GUJARAT, NORTHWEST COAST OF INDIA</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, abstract of the article is comprehensive, but clarify it "A new species of <i>Muraenesox bagio</i> was identified"</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, the concept and content of the manuscript is quite well.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References cited are not in uniform manner should follow author's guideline</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English needs improvement; I am not overly critical of this, it is understandable, but I believe it can be better.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Can be accepted after revision Author did not follow the Journals guideline in case of references and also in citation part In Taxonomical description, Genus and Species name should be in italics and the first letter of species name should be in lowercase In this part "according to source" which source? Plz mention it In Table 2. Sr. No should be changed to Sl. No. In Figure 2.a) <i>Muraenesox bagio</i> should be in italics <i>Muraenesox bagio</i> In "Sister species found in the area" there should be changed to There In "Key to closely resembling genus of family Muraenosocidae" spp should not be written in italics In Discussion, M. bagio should be in italics <i>M. bagio</i></p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pijush Payra
Department, University & Country	Ramnagar College, India