

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_12433
Title of the Manuscript:	Biological characteristics of bigeye thresher shark landed in Cilacap Ocean fishing port, Cilacap Regency, Central Java, Indonesia
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>

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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the biological characteristics and population dynamics of the bigeye thresher shark (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>), a species currently facing significant conservation challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Scientific name of bigeye thresher shark which is <i>Alopias superciliosus</i> is missing in the	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Elaborate on terms like sexual maturity categories (NC, NFC, FC) and better explain the implications of your findings. 2) The condition factor range (0.23-2.29) and the sex ratio of 1:1.7 could benefit from further contextualization. What do these values mean in terms of shark health, reproduction, or sustainability? 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Yes but</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Streamline the information about shark vulnerability to reduce redundancy. For example, In introduction section: the IUCN status of the bigeye thresher shark could be introduced once and then directly linked to the relevance of this study. 2) Present the key findings in a structured way, grouping similar data points together (e.g., length at first capture and maturity, growth patterns, sex ratio). 3) Briefly mention the study period, location, and methods used for data collection. This is somewhat embedded in the text but could be clearer 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific	The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its robust methodology and reliance on empirical data collected from the Cilacap Ocean Fishing Port during	

<p>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.</p>	<p>a specified time frame. Some suggestions: 1) Start with the global concern about shark exploitation, then narrow the focus to the relevance of Indonesian waters and the bigeye thresher shark, before introducing the study's objectives. 2) Move the objective closer to the beginning of the introduction to give the reader a clear sense of purpose early on. You could also emphasize the novelty of the study by stating that data on <i>Alopias</i> spp. is limited, making this research crucial.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>1) Some references (e.g., [13]) seem to be used multiple times for different points. While it's fine to cite the same reference for related information, over-relying on a single source can make the introduction seem less well-researched. 2) Certain important statements lack citations. For example, the claim about the global decline of shark populations ("A quarter of shark and ray populations worldwide are estimated to be in decline") should be backed up by a specific study or report. Similarly, the statement about the characteristics of the bigeye thresher shark ("Bigeye thresher shark is characterized by...") also lacks a clear citation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes but avoid redundancy and ensure clarity.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1) The lengths reported for male and female bigeye thresher sharks are clearly stated, and it's useful to compare these findings with previous studies. However, the way the data is presented could be more structured. 2) Expand on how each of these factors may impact size variation, providing specific examples or data from the literature to support these claims. 3) Why is the font style Arial and size 11? If it's a Journal style, then it's okay, but if not, it should be Times New Roman and size 12. 4) Page numbers are missing throughout the entire manuscript.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fawad Ali
Department, University & Country	Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Pakistan