

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_121870 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Study of hepatosomatic index, gonadosomatic index and fecundity of tengra fish (<i>Mystus gulio</i>): A statistical correlation and analysis |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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) |
|---|---|--|
| <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>The manuscript on the study of the hepatosomatic index, gonadosomatic index, and fecundity of tengra fish (<i>Mystus gulio</i>) is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the reproductive biology of a commercially important species. The findings, particularly the correlation between fecundity and gonad weight, can inform sustainable fisheries management in the coastal regions of West Bengal and Bangladesh. Overall, the research is well-structured and contributes to the understanding of fish ecology and reproductive dynamics, although clarity in some statistical analyses could be improved.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The title is appropriate but <u>could be more concise</u>.</p> <p>As a suggestion; Reproductive Biology and Fecundity of Tengra Fish (<i>Mystus gulio</i>): A Statistical Analysis.</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>The abstract is generally comprehensive, covering essential elements such as background, objective, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, there are areas where clarity and detail could be improved. Here are some suggestions for improve article,</p> <p>01. In introduction, - Add a <u>brief statement of the research question and rationale for studying the reproductive biology of <i>Mystus gulio</i></u>. For example: "This study aimed to investigate the reproductive biology of <i>Mystus gulio</i> to inform sustainable management strategies for this important commercial species."</p> <p>02. In Methods, - Well organized. No major changes needed. The methods are clearly described.</p> <p>03. In Results, - Consider <u>adding a sentence or two highlighting the most significant findings</u>, such as: "The peak spawning season in August and the strong positive correlation between fecundity and gonad weight are particularly notable results."</p> <p>04. In Discussion, - <u>Expand on the implications for fisheries management</u>. For instance: "These findings on the reproductive dynamics of <i>M. gulio</i> can inform management strategies to ensure sustainable fisheries. For example, regulating fishing activities during the peak spawning season in August could help protect spawning stocks."</p> <p>- <u>Elaborate on the need for further research on environmental and hormonal cues triggering spawning</u>. For example: "Further research is needed to elucidate the specific environmental factors (e.g., temperature, salinity) and hormonal cues that trigger spawning in <i>M. gulio</i>. Understanding these triggers could aid in the development of targeted management interventions."</p> <p>By incorporating these suggestions, the abstract can be strengthened by providing a <u>clearer rationale, highlighting the most significant findings, and emphasizing the practical implications for fisheries management</u>. The addition of a brief mention of future research directions also enhances the overall quality and impact of the abstract.</p> <p>As an additional suggestion, It, would be better if the key words were in alphabetical order. Fecundity, Gonadosomatic Index (GSI), Hepatosomatic Index (HIS), <i>Mystus gulio</i>, Reproductive biology</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The manuscript is structured into clear sections, which are essential for maintaining a logical flow. The subsections appear appropriate for the topic and help in logically dividing the content. However, it might be helpful to evaluate whether each subsection sufficiently covers its intended topic or if any additional subsections could enhance clarity or depth. How ever this manuscript is well-organized, with clear subsections that guide the reader through the study.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <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>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it adheres to established methodologies and provides detailed explanations of its findings. The discussion is supported by evidence from the literature, ensuring that the arguments presented are well-founded. The results are presented in a clear manner, allowing for easy interpretation and validation by others in the field.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it is based on a well-defined research question, uses appropriate methodologies, and presents its findings in a transparent manner. The data is analyzed using standard statistical methods, and the conclusions drawn are consistent with the results presented. Additionally, the discussion includes comparisons with existing literature, which strengthens the validity of the findings.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p> | <p>The references included in the manuscript are relevant and recent, indicating that the authors have engaged with current research in the field. However, depending on the content, it might be beneficial to include a few additional references, particularly from the last two years, to ensure the literature review is as up-to-date as possible. If there are any significant studies or reviews that the manuscript has overlooked, these should be mentioned.</p> | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language and English quality are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but a thorough proofreading could help in identifying any minor grammatical or stylistic issues that may improve the overall readability.</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p>Consider whether <u>the introduction could be expanded slightly to provide more background on the topic, particularly for readers who may not be specialists in the field.</u></p> <p><u>The inclusion of more visuals, such as figures or tables, could help in presenting complex data more effectively and make the manuscript more engaging.</u></p> <p>Overall, this manuscript is a valuable addition to the literature. It is well-written and presents new findings that are important for the field. Addressing the minor revisions suggested will further strengthen the paper.</p> | |

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>A.M.M.T.B Aththanayaka</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>CINEC campus, Sri Lanka</p> |