

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_122672
Title of the Manuscript:	A New Distributional Record and Taxonomic Descriptions of <i>Mierspenaeopsis hardwickii</i> (Spear Shrimp) From the Arabian sea on the Gujarat Coast, India
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
<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>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</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>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After reviewing the paper my observations are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author has not mentioned specific no of Catch on which the excrement is done. 2. It is not clearly mentioned the reason of migration. Is it accidental migration or for depletion of water quality? 3. The author has mentioned that the rostrum of the male is small which is contradictory. It may be noted here that generally male have large rostrum for sexual selection. 4. The writer has mentioned that the colour of the body is rarely pink. Normally the colour is grey. Pink colour is seen to the is newly moulted specimen. <p>After clarification all this I recommend the paper for the consideration of publication.</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:	Indrani Sarkar
Department, University & Country	Vidyasagar College, India