

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_128554
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Study on the Breeding and Feeding Behaviour of Estuarine Rice Fish, <i>Oryzias melastigma</i> (McClelland, 1839)
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript helps others researchers to understand the the behavior of <i>O. melastigma</i> . Especially the breeding and feeding behaviours of <i>O. melastigma</i> . Also, this manuscript gives an idea about the ecologic al parameters regarding to the rearing of <i>O. melastigma</i>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. the title of the article is relevant	
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 abstract is well explained. But methodology part is not mentioned. Please brief the content and include methodology in brief.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The effort of the author in this study is appreciative. But some corrections are needed in the methodology and result part also.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient. Add more supportive references in discussion part.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Communication is good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some part of the manuscript the name of fish is not wrote in italics. Please check and correct the mistake.</li> <li>2. Fish collecting method is not explained in the methodology part (Eg. Type of fishing net used).</li> <li>3. Author mentioned in the methodology that ocular micrometre is used in the study for measuring the egg diameter but the result is not included in the manuscript.</li> <li>4. The magnification of the microscope is not included (eg. 10x ,40x etc)</li> <li>5. The author mentioned in the article that statistical tools are used in this study ( ANOVA, T test). But the results are not observed in the manuscript. ( eg. Table or figures or anything related to statistical result)</li> </ol>	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sreeranjini Kamal
Department, University & Country	Catholicate College, India