Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JABB_123225**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Study Of The Relative Growth Of Bivalve Cardium Costatum (Linné, 1758) Of The Exclusive Economic Zone Of Côte D'ivoire**
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)*
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.	1.1. The first sentence can be split into two to simplify it. Also mention the filter feeding nature of bivalves and how it is important to the ecosystem 1.2. It is the most abundant species (73.37%, 48.63%, 66.49%, and 48.34% respectively the small hot and cold seasons, the great hot and cold seasons) in all the landings [3]. It is present all year round in large quantities and also has the largest shell dimensions. This presence in the catches in quantity makes it a potentially economical species and a significant source of animal protein for the populations. The fishing of this species is poorly known, and even absent from the reports of the Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture. These two sentences make contradiction.The source of data about the landings should be mentioned. The introduction part may be corrected for grammatical error. Also, the usage of language could be improved	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**		
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.	**2. Material and Method** 2.1.1 . In the heading it is mentioned Physical parameters where as in the text it is mentioned metric parameters. Make a uniform pattern 2.1.2. The range of number of specimens measured at each month should be mentioned	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	.1.1. Weight or mass? Make a uniformity 3.1.2. The representation of all figures should follow a uniform pattern, For eg: marking X axis, Y axis etc. All graph needs modifications in various aspects. 3.1.3. The growth in length could be explained by the fact that the length (the greatest distance separating the anterior edge from the posterior edge of the shell) represents the zone of dehiscence. The Bivalve will therefore tend to lengthen the opening area in order to feed, breathe and emit its gametes to the outside. This sentences need more explanation 3.2.1. Please check the usage of the term "adjustment line" at different places 3.2..2 According to these authors, the evaluation of the intensity of the bond between the total length and the total mass reveals a negative allometry between these two parameters (b <3). This difference in idea could be explained by the difference in the biotope of burrowing and fixed molluscs. Mussels and oysters attach themselves to a substrate during their development. They will therefore not be able to take advantage of the calcium contained in the sediments, unlike the family of cardiids which live in the sediments. This difference in idea could be explained by the difference in the biotope of burrowing and fixed molluscs. Mussels and oysters attach themselves to a substrate during their development. They will therefore not be able to take advantage of the calcium contained in the sediments, unlike the family of cardiids which live in the sediments. This difference in idea could be explained by the difference in the biotope of burrowing and fixed molluscs. Mussels and oysters attach themselves to a substrate during their development. They will therefore not be able to take advantage of the calcium contained in the sediments, unlike the family of cardiids which live in the sediments.	
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.	There is repetition of statements 3.2.3. Also, there are strong correlations between the different couples with regard to the high values of the correlation coefficient r. For all the graphical representations, the experimental points are ordered around the theoretical curve as demonstrated by the values of the correlation coefficients which are all high. This result means that the elongation of the shells and the enlargement of *Cardium costatum* are closely related and occur in the same direction. 3.2.4. No need to mention full name of the species throughout the text.	

Review Form 3

	3.2.5.Discussion part is poorly dealt with. Needs an improved version of discussion	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**Conclusion is an abrupt one. Needs more clarity**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Not correctly marked Not in the format Scientific names are not in italics Recent references are not refereed. The manuscript needs thorough rework before publishing.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Nagampoozhi Suja**
Department, University & Country	**CMFRI, India**