

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_87656
Title of the Manuscript:	An addition for the ichthyofaunal of India Mangroves (Sunderban Biosphere Reserve)
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript was written in poor language quality, making sections, such as the discussion, unclear. The language in the manuscript must be reviewed to ensure that author’s ideas are communicated clearly and accurately. Most flaws are highlighted in the manuscript.</p> <p>Some sentences are disconnected from the text and there are missing linking clauses and prepositions. E.g., “1831. <i>Pterois russelii</i> Bennett [E. T.] (ex Russell), <i>Proceedings of the Committee of Science and Correspondence of the Zoological Society of London</i> 1830-31, 1:128 (Coromandel coast, India, eastern Indian Ocean), No Type specimen preserved.”</p> <p>The results section should be rearranged to provide better writing flow.</p> <p>This study reports a reef-associated fish in mangrove ecosystem of Bengal. Although this information provides an important insight to the ecosystem management and species conservation, the manuscript is poorly written. First, English language must be deeply reviewed, then the manuscript should be submitted for another review round.</p> <p>I would recommend the acceptance for publication after major revision.</p>	<p>Comment Rev 3: Are both Sunderban and Sundarban correct terms to designate the area? Reply : Authors would like to inform that both terms are correct and they are used to designate the same area.</p> <p>Comment Rev 9: Do you mean that <i>S. guamensis</i> occurs only in Andaman and Nicobar Islands? Reply : Small mangrove patches are distributed in several parts of India, Andaman Nicobar Island also have a mangrove patch and <i>Scorpaenodes guamensis</i> is the only fish belonging to the family that had been recorded from the mangrove patch of ANI. And no other species of the family as well as <i>S. guamensis</i> is absent from any of the indian mangrove patches except ANI. Mention sentence is only concerned with the mangrove ecosystem of India.</p> <p>Comment Rev 20: I suggest you to move the following information to a table. Reply : Respectfully the authors would like to inform that the systematics of the species is normally written in line and not in a table.</p> <p>Comment Rev 22: This sentence is disconnected from the text. Reply : Authors would like to inform that the sentence is describing the taxonomic identification and first authors publication, collection locality of the described species, which is a normal protocol for any taxonomic description of a species and that is not connected with the main text.</p> <p>Comment Rev 1, Rev 2, Rev 4, Rev 5, Rev 6, Rev 7, Rev 8, Rev 10, Rev 11, Rev 12, Rev 13, Rev 14, Rev 15, Rev 16, Rev 17, Rev 18, Rev 21, Rev 25, Rev 26, Rev 27, Rev 28, Rev 29, Rev 30, Rev 31, Rev 32, Rev 33, Rev 34, Rev 35, Rev 36, Rev 37. Reply: Necessary changes and corrections has been carried out.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The phylum was wrongly assigned in topic 3. It should be changed to Chordata. The unit of measurement in topic 3.2 are incorrect. I believe it is mm instead of cm.</p>	<p>The phylum was wrongly assigned in topic 3</p> <p>Reply : Necessary changes has been made.</p> <p>It should be changed to Chordata. The unit of measurement in topic 3.2 are incorrect. I believe it is mm instead of cm</p> <p>Reply : Authors would like to inform that the measurements are in correct format and that is cm.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>I would like to suggest an alternative title: First record of <i>Pterois russelii</i> in the Sunderban Biosphere Reserve, India.</p>	<p>Authors would like to inform that the title has been changes as per the sugesion.</p>

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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	<p>NO, There is no ethical issues related to the work.</p>