

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The article is interesting and presents results that can update the information on the bigeye thresher shark or fill existing information gaps. Generating data on pelagic sharks, which are challenging to study, is always appreciated. Moreover, by presenting important migration patterns, regionalizing the information can provide a more comprehensive view of the species' status across its entire geographic range.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and contains the appropriate information. However, we must be careful with some spelling mistakes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific 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>The manuscript contains too many spelling errors; to cite one, the title of the "Sex Ratio" column in Table 1 is misspelled. The definition of the study duration is confusing. In the third line of "Study Area," it is mentioned that "The research was conducted from March to April 2023," but throughout the rest of the document, the dates "March to June 2023" are mentioned. I believe it is necessary to be more explicit about how the logistic model was adjusted to estimate the mean size at maturity and the length at first capture. Additionally, the writing of the methodology for the Condition Factor (K) is quite confusing, particularly lines 6-10 of the "Data Analysis" paragraph. I also consider that the</p>	

	results should be presented based on the order in which the methods were written: the length-weight relationship (LWR) is mentioned first, but the first result shown is the length at first capture	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I consider the language to be scientifically accurate; however, it is necessary to correct the spelling throughout the document using software specifically designed for that purpose.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Although the data collected in this article is extensive, the statistical methods and models used for its analysis are not properly detailed. It is necessary to elaborate further on the description of the logistic model and the test used to statistically determine whether the slope of the length-weight relationship model differs from 3. The writing on the condition factor is very confusing. The model fitting method is not mentioned, and the discussion is weak.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Daniel Carrillo Colín
Department, University & Country	UNAM, Mexico