SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_47885**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Determination of the sexual maturity of Threadfins *Polydactylus quadrifilis* (Cuvier, 1829), *Galeoides decadactylus* (Bloch, 1795) and *Pentanemus quinquarius* (Linné, 1758) of the artisanal marine fishery of Grand-Lahou (Côte d'Ivoire).**
Type of the 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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	**Abstract:** Reproduction, sexual maturity, sex ratio, Polynemidae, Ivory Coast **Introduction:** the introduction is written in one paragraph. The problem must be written in a paragraph different from that of the context / Similarly, the specific objectives were not listed at the end of the introduction; yet this is the key to the writing plan of the following chapters **Materials and methods:** **-**we note missing parts (ex: study area, statistical analysis), we must still rearrange (see the manuscript) **-** the methodology is not well detailed because it does not specify by the materials used (ex: one reads only "the total length and the standard length were taken" or the sex was obtained after dissection ...) **Results and discussion:** -All the figures are superimposed; arrange all your figures because I do not understand anything and cannot say anything about - present the results and discussion by parameter studied. Therefore, you should give a title to each result to facilitate the understanding of the work	
Minor REVISION comments	See the MS	
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Tiogué Tekounegning Claudine***
Department, University & Country	***The University of Dschang, Cameroon***