

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_120756
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on toxic effects of pesticides on various physiological aspects of fish
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The article is focussing on the ill effects of pesticides on aquatic animals, in particular fish species. However, the introductory part is very generic and not specific. It is totally generalized, like a newsletter, not a review article. The article is lined up under specific subheadings as picking up one sentence from each referred article as beads and tied up like a string, with high irrelevancy.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>OK</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract is very normal, with no clarity of a review article.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections is acceptable to some extent. But, the discussions under the sub topics are not aptful with dislocation of informations.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Under Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have significant economic, aesthetic, nutritional, industrial, religious and medicinal value. It should be values 2. Pyrethroids are more favored than other kinds of insecticides, as Lu <i>et al.</i>, [9] stated because they are very effective, less toxic to mammals, more selective to pests, and degrade quickly in the environment. Organophosphates (OPs) are poisonous to insects because they inhibit the enzyme acetylcholinesterase (AChE) and stop acetylcholine from being broken down in nerve junctions, which results in nerve damage and death according to [10]. What? 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references (73) are overdose for this article. Many of them are 10 years/20 years old references. Specific references have to be included.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The entire review article appears like a cut, copy, paste with no clear focus of what is to be dealt in a review. Hence, it lags suitability as a scholarly communication</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Major revision is suggested.</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:	N. Muthulakshmi Andai
Department, University & Country	PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, India