

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130359
Title of the Manuscript:	"First Recorded Occurrence and Morphological Study of Paraplagusia bilineata in the Arabian Sea, Gujarat, Northwest Coast of India"
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it documents the first recorded occurrence of <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> in the Arabian Sea along the Gujarat coast, expanding the known geographical distribution of this rare flatfish species. It provides detailed morphometric data, contributing to the taxonomic knowledge and aiding in the accurate identification of <i>P. bilineata</i> . The findings enhance our understanding of the biodiversity in the region and underscore the importance of continuous monitoring and documentation of marine species to assess ecological changes and conservation needs. Such studies are invaluable for fisheries management and biodiversity conservation in the Arabian Sea.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article, "First Recorded Occurrence and Morphological Study of Paraplagusia bilineata in the Arabian Sea, Gujarat, Northwest Coast of India," is generally suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It highlights the two main aspects of the study: the first recorded occurrence of <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> in the region and the morphological study conducted for its identification. However, it could be slightly refined for clarity and conciseness. For example, "First Record and Morphological Study of <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> in the Arabian Sea off Gujarat, Northwest India" maintains the essence while being more concise. This version avoids repetition and emphasizes the key findings effectively.	The authors have incorporated the suggested changes as per the reviewer's comments

Review Form 3

<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>The abstract effectively outlines the main findings of the study, including the first recorded occurrence of <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> in Gujarat, details of the specimen, and the morphometric study conducted. However, it can be enhanced for comprehensiveness and better readability. Below are suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Ecological or Conservation Significance: Briefly mention the importance of this discovery in terms of biodiversity, ecosystem monitoring, or potential implications for conservation efforts.Methodology: Include a very brief mention of the methodology, such as how the specimen was identified using morphometric parameters and compared to existing taxonomic data.Context or Comparison: Highlight whether similar findings have been reported in neighboring regions or how this discovery contributes to the broader knowledge of marine biodiversity.	<p>The authors have incorporated the suggested changes as per the reviewer's comments</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the provided details. It documents the first recorded occurrence of <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> in Gujarat, provides accurate measurements of the specimen, and mentions a detailed morphological analysis involving 18 morphometric parameters for taxonomic identification. However, the following points should be considered to ensure scientific rigor:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Clear Identification: The study uses morphometric parameters, a reliable method for species identification, ensuring the findings are scientifically sound.Geographical Context: The manuscript appropriately highlights the novelty of the discovery in Gujarat, adding to the scientific understanding of the species' distribution.Relevance: The documentation of a rare species is valuable for biodiversity and ecological studies, particularly in marine habitats. <p>Recommendations for Confirmation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Comparative Analysis: Ensure the study includes a comparison with previous records of <i>P. bilineata</i> from other regions to validate the identification.Environmental Data: Consider including additional environmental parameters (e.g., water temperature, salinity) to provide context about the habitat where the specimen was found.Genetic Validation: If possible, molecular techniques like DNA barcoding could be used to complement the morphological identification for higher accuracy. <p>Minor Corrections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Grammar and Formatting: Phrases like "Previously, <i>P. bilineata</i> was not reported in Gujarat" and "P. bilineatawas not reported inGujarat" have typographical errors that should be corrected.Consistency in Reporting: The depth (30–32 m) is mentioned, but any implications of this specific depth for the species' habitat preference could be briefly discussed.	<p>Response to Reviewer's Recommendations for Confirmation</p> <p>Comparative Analysis: "The comparative analysis has been included in the Results and Discussion section, where the morphometric data from this study is compared with the data from Froese and Pauly (2024). Due to the absence of similar studies, only one comparison could be made."</p> <p>Environmental Data: "As the specimens in this study were caught as bycatch by fishermen using a trawler, environmental data such as water temperature and salinity were not available."</p> <p>Genetic Validation: "The focus of this study was to provide a morphological description of <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> along with a new record for its distribution. Therefore, molecular validation was not included in this study."</p> <p>Minor Corrections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">The grammar and formatting have been reviewed and corrected using online proofreading services.The depth (30–32 m) at which the specimen was caught is mentioned. However, due to the nature of the study focusing on morphological description and distribution, further analysis of habitat preference based on depth has not been included.
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references listed are fairly comprehensive and include a mix of classical works, such as Day (1888) and FAO species sheets (Fischer, 1984), along with more recent studies and databases like FishBase (2024) and the IUCN Red List (2021). These references are relevant to the manuscript as they provide taxonomic, ecological, and regional biodiversity information about fish species, including <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> and related ichthyofaunal diversity.</p> <p>Assessment of References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Sufficiency: The references appear sufficient for the study, covering foundational taxonomic literature, regional studies on ichthyofaunal diversity, and global species databases.	<p>The works of Talwar & Kacker (1984) and Fischer (1984) have been included as they serve as foundational references for ichthyological studies, providing baseline taxonomic information that remains relevant and widely cited in the field.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">molecular tools were not utilized in the present study as the primary objective was to focus on traditional morphometrics for species identification and description. While molecular studies provide valuable validation, they are outside the scope of this study, which is

Review Form 3

	<div>2. Recency: Several references are recent (2021–2024), which is a strength. However, some references are older (e.g., Talwar & Kacker, 1984; Fischer, 1984), which, while still valuable for foundational knowledge, may need supplementation with recent advancements in taxonomy and biodiversity.</div> <div>3. Regional Relevance: The references focus well on the Gujarat coast and related ichthyofaunal studies, which aligns with the scope of the manuscript.</div> <div>Suggestions for Additional References:</div> <div>1. Recent Molecular Studies: Include references to studies using molecular tools for species confirmation, as this adds a modern validation perspective to taxonomic work. Examples:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Ward, R.D., et al. (2009). "DNA barcoding for species identification in fish." <i>Marine and Freshwater Research</i>.Lakra, W.S., et al. (2016). "DNA barcoding Indian marine fishes." <i>Mitochondrial DNA Part A</i>.</div> <div>2. Updated Regional Biodiversity Assessments:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Consider more recent publications or reviews of marine biodiversity along the Arabian Sea or Gujarat coast.</div> <div>3. Ecological Studies: If available, references that explore the habitat preferences, ecological roles, or conservation challenges of <i>Paraplagusia bilineata</i> or related species could enhance the manuscript.</div>	<div>centered on morphological taxonomy.</div> <div>2: The manuscript has incorporated studies on the ichthyofaunal diversity along the Gujarat coast, including both foundational and recent research. These references provide a comprehensive background relevant to the study area and support the findings presented.</div> <div>3: The main aim of this study was to provide a detailed taxonomic description and report a new distribution record for the species. While ecological studies are valuable, they fall beyond the scope of the current manuscript. Future studies could delve into the habitat preferences, ecological roles, and conservation challenges of the species.</div>
--	---	---

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language quality of the article is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where minor improvements can enhance readability and professionalism. Here's an assessment and suggestions for improvement:</p> <hr/> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Clarity: The content communicates the findings clearly and logically.Scientific Terminology: Appropriate use of technical terms like "morphometric parameters," "taxonomic identification," and "Cyanoglossidae." <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Grammatical Errors:<ul style="list-style-type: none">The phrase "<i>P. bilineata</i> was not reported in Gujarat" contains typographical errors. It should read: "<i>P. bilineata</i> was not reported in Gujarat."The word "<i>Cyanoglossidae</i>" should be italicized for consistency with scientific nomenclature.Redundancy:<ul style="list-style-type: none">The sentence "<i>This study serves as the initial report of the presence of Paraplagusia bilineata from Dholai fishing harbour, Gujarat, on the Northwest coast of India</i>" repeats information unnecessarily. It can be streamlined.Sentence Structure:<ul style="list-style-type: none">The sentence "<i>In total, 18 morphometric parameters were closely observed and recorded for the taxonomic identification and confirmation of the species</i>" can be made more concise: "<i>Eighteen morphometric parameters were analyzed to confirm the species' taxonomic identity.</i>"Scholarly Precision:<ul style="list-style-type: none">The phrase "<i>additional record</i>" may confuse readers since the article describes a first record for Gujarat. Consider rephrasing for precision: "<i>The present study reports the first occurrence of the rare flatfish...</i>" <p>The language is generally appropriate for scholarly communication but would benefit from minor grammatical corrections, streamlined sentences, and precise wording to enhance clarity and professionalism.</p>	The authors have incorporated the suggested changes as per the reviewer's comments
Optional/General comments	NA	

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)	