

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125441
Title of the Manuscript:	Conservation Status of Fishes Reported from Tapi District of Gujarat, India
Type of the 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.	The manuscript is very important for the scientific community to know about ecosystem stability, food security and the economic value of fisheries. This manuscript exhibits genetic variation within fish species and among populations. Also enabling the scientific community to study and appreciate aquatic ecosystem.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Title of the article is suitable.	
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 abstract of the article is comprehensive. I think there is no need to include the scientific name of the fish species in this section. The name of the species' family and its number should suffice. Because there should not be much description in the abstract part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.	
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.	I think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. But in this manuscript, there are some shortcomings in statistical analysis. A graphic representation of data could be done to make the manuscript more attractive. Figures of the collected fish are not clear to understand. Photographs of the sample should be taken by following the scientific method.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. Proper format style was not used. Therefore, it can be used Nelson, J. S., Grande, T. C., & Wilson, M. V. H. (2016). <i>Fishes of the world</i> . John Wiley & Sons. as a recent reference.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the article is average for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Spelling mistake should avoid. Like here:</p> <p>Nelson, J. S., 1994. <i>Fishes of the World</i>. 3rd Edn. Johm Wiley & Sons, New York.</p> <p>Nelson, J. S., 2006. <i>Fishes of the World</i>. 4th Edn. Johm Wiley & Sons, New Jersey.</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:	Fatema Tuj Juhra
Department, University & Country	University of Chittagong, Bangladesh