

### Review Form 3

c	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The paper is well-structured and concise, and it should be appropriately presented in the format of a scientific note. Its relevance is highlighted by the documentation of the first occurrence of <i>Mierspenaeopsis hardwickii</i> in the Dholai fishing harbor, Gujarat. This manuscript makes a substantial contribution to marine biodiversity research, particularly in the context of the geographic distribution of <i>Mierspenaeopsis hardwickii</i>. The discovery of this species in the Dholai fishing harbor is significant, as it addresses a notable gap in the research on species diversity along the Gujarat coast. The comprehensive taxonomic descriptions and morphological analyses presented in the manuscript provide valuable information for future comparative studies. However, authors must adhere to the international rules of zoological nomenclature. This includes presenting species names in italics, along with the names of the authors and the corresponding years. Additionally, it is essential to accurately address the correct form when dealing with synonymous species.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>A New Distributional Record and Taxonomic Descriptions of <i>Mierspenaeopsis hardwickii</i> (Miers, 1878) From the Arabian Sea on the Gujarat Coast, India</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is clear and concise but could be improved by briefly including the following points:  Methodology: Mention the methods used for identifying and describing <i>Mierspenaeopsis hardwickii</i>, such as specific identification keys or morphological analysis. Significance: Highlight the potential ecological or commercial implications of this discovery to emphasize the broader impact of the study. Please opt to replace the word "shellfish" with "crustaceans" throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>To ensure that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, it is essential to adopt a precise approach for the identification and description of the specimens. In the methodology, the authors conducted detailed morphological analyses, using the taxonomic keys of Fischer (1984) and basing the description on the genus <i>Mierspenaeopsis</i>, proposed by Sakai &amp; Shinomiya (2011) that proposed that the new classification was primarily based on various structures, particularly focusing on the male petasma region. Clearly including these references is crucial. Additionally, in the discussion, it would be relevant to address the ecological and geographical significance of the discovery, enhancing the understanding of marine biodiversity and its implications for future research.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>The citation of species nomenclature must strictly adhere to taxonomic standards. It is recommended to refer to the checklist by De Grave &amp; Fransen in Carideorum Catalogus (Crustacea: Decapoda), published in Zoologische Mededelingen Leiden 85 (2011). This catalog covers the recent species of dendrobranchiates. Additionally, the works by K. Sakai and S. Shinomiya (2011) and Fischer (1984) should also be referenced and listed in the bibliography. It is necessary to include bibliographic references on the geographic distribution of this species. In the references section, it is essential to follow the guidelines established by the journal. Please review the submission rules of the periodical.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication; however, some minor revisions are needed to improve clarity and readability. Specific areas where the English could be refined include grammar, sentence structure, and word choice to ensure precision and coherence throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The article needs to be reviewed to ensure that, throughout the text, the names of genera and species are italicized and followed by the author and year of publication, in accordance with taxonomic citation rules. Additionally, ensure that the guidelines for citing species in synonymy and for citing family names, also with author and year, are correctly followed.</p> <p><b>Figure 1</b> In Figure 1, increase the font size of the captions, as it is currently too small. Add latitude and longitude projections to the map, as well as a scale in kilometers. Adjust the magnitude to highlight what you wish to emphasize and ensure that the captions follow a consistent format. I suggest highlighting the location where the shrimp were collected on the map and including this information solely in the caption within the map.</p> <p><b>Figure 2</b> In Figure 2, it is recommended to adjust the scale for better clarity by replacing it with a scale bar in centimeters or millimeters.</p> <p><b>Table 1</b> In the table, clearly specify whether the measurements are in centimeters or millimeters.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b> In the methodology section, please include details about the capture of the shrimp, such as the estimated length of the trawl nets used by the boat, the depth reached, and the dates when the capture occurred. It would also be useful to specify whether smaller specimens were released and not used in the research, and to mention if other shrimp species were captured along with <i>Mierspenaeopsis hardwickii</i>.</p> <p><b>Morphological parameters</b> In the methodology section, provide details on how the shrimp measurements were conducted. Specify whether measurements were taken using specific software or a caliper. Additionally, clarify the method used for sexing the shrimp, including whether a stereoscopic microscope was employed.</p> <p><b>Result and Discussion</b> In the results section, ensure you specify the exact number of shrimp found and measured (male and female), providing detailed quantities to enhance the clarity and accuracy of the presented data in Table 1.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Olga Alcantara Barros</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Regional do Cariri (URCA), Brazil</b>