

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_129797
Title of the Manuscript:	Determining the Main Morphometrical Traits to Describe Body Weight in Male Hampala Barb Fish ( <i>Hampala macrolepidota</i> )
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>

#### **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.	Author should emphasize on why it is important to determine weight using morphometrical traits in Hampala Barb. This should be mentioned in introduction as a research problem. The application of the knowledge found in this study should be mention in this part, as audience struggle to understand why this research is needed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>The abstract needs a thorough English proof reading as some sentence just does not make any sense. Please send to proofreading from improvement or use AI to improve the sentence. The reviewer would also suggest to elaborate on the method as it was only mentioned, “survey method” (what kind of survey method?) and how many individuals were used to measure the fish.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript lack scientific writing/presentation style. Map provided is not suitable to be presented as it does not show the sampling points properly. The legends are not relevant to the study and are not named accordingly.</p> <p>“Sampling of coal fish used the census method” The above sentence does not make sense as there is no mention of coal fish in the manuscript. What is coal fish?. Please elaborate on the census method used. Whether the fish were caught in the river, or bought from the nearby market. How many individuals were sampled in this study, and why it is relevant to mention that the fish were sampled once in 2 weeks from February to April 2018? The morphometric measurement should cite a credible source such as Kottelat, M (1993). Although it is a good practice to take the environmental measurements parameters but the reviewers feels that it is not directly relevant to the aims of this study. Reviewer has no comment on the statistical analysis, it look sound but with the unknown “n” value the data is hard to verify the significance of the finding and it is hard to verify a solid conclusion to the study.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Most of the reference are local and author should add more reference comparison to classical cyprinids morphometric study such as by Kottelat, M.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Article needs to be revised for the proofreading in English as some of the sentence does not make sense. It is not suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Shazana Sharir</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia</b></p>