



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_49722
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on some biological aspects of Giant snakehead fish (<i>Chana micropeltes</i>) in Huai Suea Ten wetland site in Thailand
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	<p>Check grammar for manuscript??? It makes reading and understanding quite difficult Introduction- 24 to 29, 39,41</p> <p>Huai Suea Ten wetland site is located in Nam Phong District, Khon Kaen Province where is in the northeast of Thailand. Huai Suea Ten wetland is considered as the aquaculture areas that are a main animal protein source for people who live in Khon Kaen province. Therefore, this wetland has been paid attention by researchers. Sri and Pornpongrungrueng (2013) studied Huai Suea Ten wetland was abundant in both plants and aquatic plant along the water-course bank. However, the native fish species; especially giant snakehead fish, and their biological aspects have not studied yet.</p> <p>-Continue with the correction on subsequent pages.</p> <p>Materials and Methods- Sample collection: Did you collect fish alive or dead? How did you transport the fish? State clearly and concisely these processes. Include as well the medium in which the fish was collected into.</p> <p>Results and discussion- Table 2,3,4 are well organised and easy to study the differences. Plotting are also easy to understand the significant differences as shown. Conclusion- GSI value showing dominance of females having higher gonads than males is expected. This is same in human beings.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract-10 delete highlighted There were 36 fish species belonging to 17 families were observed at 10 sampling sites</p>	
Optional/General comments	The study is very informative	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stella Agyemang Duah
Department, University & Country	Szent Istvan University, Hungary