



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_47351
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of hyperthermia on erythrocyte parameters of carp from Bardaca swamp Cyprinus carpio (Linnaeus, 1758)
Type of the Article	Original 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:

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



SDI 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refrain the topic, <i>Cyprinus carpio</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) should come immediately after carp, country may be included. On the topic, is it hypertermy or hyperthermy? 2. A better map with co-ordinates showing the study area should be drawn. 3. In table 1, why representing all the values with comma (,) instead of point (.) eg 0,25±0,04? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effects of hyperthermia on erythrocyte parameters of carp <i>Cyprinus carpio</i> (Linnaeus, 1758) from Bardaca swamp, Bosnia and Herzegovina 2. We appreciate your comment and now have put in a better map with co-ordinates. 3. The value is now corrected in the paper with (.).
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract; correct the mistake in line 7 2. Line 24 – correct to physico-chemical 3. Lines 29-30, “according to documented fact “, the aim of the study. Documented where? Is this a plagiarised work? 4. Line 49 ; Figure 1 Map showing Bardaca swamp should be written immediately below the map. 5. Lines 46-48; correct the sentence to convey meaning 6. Lines 39-44; considering these lines , and line 44 in particular that gives the size of the pond, were the fish used for this study obtained from the pond or a natural swamp environment? 7. Lines 56-57; the expression is grammatically wrong, correct please. 8. Line 145 correct x1012 to the correct value , 10¹² 9. Line 165 is grammatically wrong, effect correction. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. and an increase the value of other erythrocyte parameters. 2. physico-chemical 3. This is not a plagiarised work, it's just a mistake, and now the sentence begins “The aim of this study.....”. 4. Corrected. 5. In the last 50 years, the great anthropogenic influence on the one hand has enabled the survival of this ecosystem, and on the other hand destroyed it. 6. Within the swamp area of Bardaca were built fishponds whose the total area of the fishpond is about 658 hectares, and for the purpose of this research were used fish from the natural ecosystem. 7. Changing water and filters, analysis of the concentration of oxygen and ammonium ions was done daily for the necessary adaptation of fish. 8. Corrected. 9. Hematological evaluation is significant in the early detection of health problems and very important in physiological adaptations to stress factors. Energy metabolic requirements are very pronounced during hyperthermia, and as the best indicators for fish adaptation are erythrocyte and MCV values. The fact is that fish adaptations depend on the type and age, as well as other parameters. Therefore the blood parameters analysis must be very careful and the results must be clarified for each species individually. Our research has shown that <i>Cyprinus carpio</i> possesses very good physiological adjustments to environmental stressors such as water temperatures.
Optional/General comments	The author(s) should carefully read through the work and effect the necessary corrections.	The author(s) carefully read the work and corrected necessary corrections. Yes

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)	