

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_128916
Title of the Manuscript:	DENSITY OF GREEN MUSSELS (<i>Perna viridis</i>) AND ITS IMPACT ON GROWTH AND LEAD ACCUMULATION IN POLYCULTURE SYSTEMS IN TROPICAL WATERS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The paper intituled 'DENSITY OF GREEN MUSSELS (<i>Perna viridis</i>) AND ITS IMPACT ON GROWTH AND LEAD ACCUMULATION IN POLYCULTURE SYSTEMS IN TROPICAL WATERS'. This study looked at the growth and contaminant load of lead in green mussels in the implanted Ujungpangkah Subdistrict, Gresik, East Java, with a particular emphasis on the capability of Pb to bioaccumulate according to the mussel density.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient study duration • The difference in density is not significant, compared with a study area of 1 m² • All bioaccumulation studies use concentrations in mg/kg or µg/g; it is necessary to convert all concentrations into ms • You mentioned earlier that statistical analyses show stocking density did not significantly influence growth. There is a contradiction in the results. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The major problem is that data for this study is limited, only 1 metal were analysis. Moreover, samples were collected during 21 days. Metals bioaccumulation is very dynamic and thus trace metal concentrations can fluctuate by magnitudes. Without seasonal sampling or time series sampling, it can only provide a snapshot not the actual average concentration levels. Furthermore, the results do not give any novelty and does not meet the basic requirements of the journal. All the interpretations should be justified by suitable supporting articles of similar nature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Request for a minor change of the English language	
Optional/General comments		

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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yassine Guendouzi
Department, University & Country	University Center of Tipaza, Algeria