

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_124953
Title of the Manuscript:	Taxonomic Study of Monogenean Parasites Infesting Cyprinus carpio and Liza abu in Lake Balloran Dam- Syria (eastern Mediterranean).
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This study is of fundamental interest on the one hand for science and on the other hand for the knowledge of parasitic biodiversity in general and on the Asian continent in particular, this work reveals the identification of five species of monogeneans in two host fish (the common carp and the Abu mullet), but the manuscript requires a global rewriting because it lacks a lot of detail to add ranging from the summary to the conclusion.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Change of the word taxonomic study to the word inventory, because taxonomy reflects the identification of a very large number of species through the examination and study of a fairly representative sample and in this study, the work was done on a very small number of host fish (68 individuals) resulting in the identification of five parasitic monogeneans belonging to two genera (<i>Dactylogyrus</i> and <i>Gyrodactylus</i>)	
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.	The second paragraph of the abstract (the most important part of the abstract) is very poorly written and requires a lot of strength to understand the main results...it needs to be clearer and more readable than that. You clearly mention the species identified for each host fish.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but it lacks some subtitles in the material and methods section and the results section, in the latter I propose to add a table that represents the organ of infestation of each species of monogenean (skin, fins, gills, oral cavity or nasal pits).	
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>Scientifically: the five species identified are enormous and reflect the seriousness of the work but it needs to clarify some points in the introduction part; it is necessary to mention the objective of this work and the choice of this theme and the site...???? lack of detail on the keys to identify parasitic monogeneans (material and methods part). Very short and specific discussion of the species identified in the host fish <i>C. carpio</i> without any comparison of the species collected in the fish <i>Liza abu</i>...it requires enough work and a complete reformulation and to broaden the comparison to other continents such as Africa, North America, Europe and not to be narrow to the region of Syria or Asia only because the common carp is a fish that has a wide distribution throughout the world.</p> <p>Technically: sampling is very low for a whole year, and I recommend increasing sampling effort because larger sampling leads to detecting rare species; species diversity data can be better analyzed, and seasonality of communities can be more clearly determined.</p> <p>The method of study and the material used in the collection, assembly, identification keys and measurements of monogeneans are not monitionized.</p> <p>Present a more sophisticated and readable geographic map of the study site with an exhibition of the different sampling points using mapping software such as Mapinfo or ARC gis....</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are not sufficient given the short discussion referred. I recommend adding the following references: ABDULLAH & MAMA (2011); AL-MARJAN & ABDULLAH (2009); ALLALGUA et al. (2015); BORJI et al. (2012).	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good quality of scientific writing	
Optional/General comments	Avery important research topic with enormous results (identification of five species of monogeneans), but the manuscript requires a lot of work and improvement to be added to properly present the importance of the work and the results obtained.	

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:	Amel Allalqua
Department, University & Country	University of Souk Ahras, Algeria