

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 (Mystus gulio): A statistical correlation and analysis |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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. | Overall, it's okay. The text of this article is concise and the research results are presented through charts. It strengthens the research motivation, research methods and application of future contributions, and the extension of academic topics. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | 1.It is recommended to delete redundant words. Study of hepatosomatic index, gonadosomatic index and fecundity of tengra fish (Mystus gulio): A statistical correlation and analysis | |
| 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. | The motivation for the research can be stated more precisely, for example: <i>Prior studies have demonstrated a positive association between GSI (Gonadosomatic Index) and Fecundity, but no research has been conducted to establish any correlation between HSI (Hepatosomatic Index) and Fecundity.</i> | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | It is recommended to enhance the findings, research methods and major research issues of past literature. | |
| 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. | 1.It is recommended to add additional explanations of data results regarding the experimental process or charts to facilitate readers' understanding. 2. A link to this sentence should be added at the end of the article to strengthen the echo of the article. <i>These findings provide valuable insights into the reproductive dynamics of M. gulio and can inform management strategies for sustainable fisheries. Further research is needed to elucidate the environmental and hormonal cues triggering spawning in this species.</i> | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The number of documents should be sufficient, and whether there are representative articles or suggestions for compiling analysis results. It is recommended to organize past literature to supplement the research findings. It is recommended to update the research literature on relevant topics discussed within the past five years. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|------|--|
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Fair | |
| Optional/General comments | No | |

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: | Po-Hsien Chiu |
| Department, University & Country | Cheng Shiu University, Taiwan |