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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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.** | **The manuscript would be a good contribution as baseline information for the scientific community and the management body/stakeholders to take management action for sustainable production in Southern Philippine Waters.** | The study aims to provide essential baseline information that can support both the scientific community and fisheries management bodies in developing evidence-based strategies. By highlighting key reproductive and growth characteristics of *Euthynnus affinis,* the findings contribute to informed decision-making for sustainable production and conservation in Southern Philippine Waters. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title needs modification as “Morphometric and Reproductive Biology of Euthynnus affinis in Southern Philippine Waters”**   * Sex ratio and size at first maturity were not a topic; it is an objective of the study. * Positive allometric growth should not be a topic; it is the finding of your research study. | The title modification to “Morphometric and Reproductive Biology of Euthynnus affinis in Southern Philippine Waters” is noted. Additionally, the mention of sex ratio and size at first maturity should be framed as objectives of the study rather than topics. Similarly, the reference to positive allometric growth should be presented as a key finding of the research rather than a standalone topic.  The original title, “Morphometric and Reproductive Trends Reveal Near-Equal Sex Ratio, Positive Allometric Growth, and Early Maturity of Euthynnus affinis in Southern Philippine Waters”, is preferred as it effectively highlights the study’s key findings. This phrasing immediately informs readers of the primary outcomes, aligning with the goal of capturing interest while conveying the study’s significance. Including specific findings such as sex ratio, growth patterns, and maturity levels emphasizes the study’s contributions to fisheries biology and management, making the title both informative and engaging. |
| 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. | * Please Mention the design and Duration of Study here * it needs to be mentioned the sampling year, frequency and materials before the author stated the findings * **Like** total of 1,314 Euthynnus affinis specimens were collected (ranging between - and -3 cm in total length (FL), while – to - g total weight (TW)) using gillnets -- etc mesh size during November 2020 to March 2021. * Fishery management is Key word check it?? | This information has been provided in the Methods section. We opted not to include it in the abstract to maintain conciseness and focus on the key findings, as recommended for structured abstracts. However, we acknowledge the importance of mentioning the study design and duration, as well as sampling details, before presenting the results.To address this, the following details are included in the Methods: We also added this to the abstract as you stated. A total of 1,314 *Euthynnus affinis* specimens were collected, ranging from cm in fork length (FL) and g in total weight (TW). Sampling was conducted using gill nets during the period from November 2020 to March 2021, with collections made at every new moon phase of each month, This information ensures clarity regarding the study's scope, timeframe, and methodology.  We opted to include "fishery management" as a keyword to enhance the discoverability of the study for researchers and practitioners interested in sustainable fisheries and resource management. Given that the findings contribute to understanding the population dynamics and biological characteristics of *Euthynnus affinis*, they are relevant for informing fisheries regulations, conservation strategies, and harvest guidelines. Including this keyword aligns the study with broader discussions on fisheries sustainability, stock assessment, and ecosystem-based management, ensuring it reaches an audience focused on applying scientific insights to real-world fisheries management practices. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | -the manuscript needs arrangement | We reviewed the manuscript's structure to ensure clarity, logical flow, and coherence. Particular attention was given to the sequence of sections, alignment with journal guidelines, and smooth transitions between the introduction, methods, results, and discussion. We also ensured that background information, data presentation, and interpretations were appropriately placed to enhance readability and comprehension. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | -Please used the updated referencing, most of your reference were old,  -Use additional recent referencing | Additional recent references have been incorporated to ensure the study aligns with current literature and advancements in the field. The reference list has been updated accordingly. Although recent studies were incorporated, the older citations were retained to provide historical context and studies, as the introduction discusses the foundational research on the reproductive biology of the species. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript needs grammar, punctuation restructuring  -most sentences were fragmented  -Check the grammar, structure, spacing and punctuation of your sentences | We have revised the manuscript to address grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure issues. Fragmented sentences were restructured for clarity and coherence. Additionally, grammar, spacing, and punctuation were carefully checked to ensure consistency and readability throughout the manuscript. |
| Optional/General comments | Sampling was conducted for seven days during each new moon phase to generate data for assessing the gonadosomatic index and determining the species' spawning period, as well as to evaluate size at maturity, fecundity, and gonadal development stages. All collected specimens underwent on-site examination for gross morphological characteristics and morphometric measurements, while gonads, stomachs, and otoliths were extracted for laboratory analysis.   * At the end of the introduction you stated all these sentence but never been incorporated the gonadosomatic index, fecundity, and peck spawning period in the result and discussion section * otoliths were extracted for laboratory analysis is used for age determination for population dynamic estimation like MSY and MSEY analysis but I have never seen this in the manuscript * please delete the research question stated at the end of the introduction * the introduction needs winnow and add the updated research findings some of them were old * The caption of figure 1 should not be bold * the literature review omitted from the material and methods section (length-weight relationship) * the referencing style was inconsistently arranged, it needs critical correction * Revise your way of citation e.g.; Sadovy de Mitcheson & Liu, 2008 (used as de Mitcheson & Liu, 2008) check all through the paper. * please follow the journal author guidelines for example the author missed these sections; * Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, Authors’ Contributions, etc. * Make sure you are using the same font and font size throughout your manuscript. * Put similar ideas in a paragraph, e.g., look at your methodology section, (which is missed in the result section). Check this through your manuscript. | 1. We have removed the sentence: "All collected specimens underwent on-site examination for gross morphological characteristics and morphometric measurements, while gonads, stomachs, and otoliths were extracted for laboratory analysis." This content is not relevant to the current manuscript, as it pertains to another study we are still working on. Therefore, references to the gonadosomatic index, fecundity, peak spawning period, and otolith analysis were intentionally excluded from the results and discussion sections of this paper. 2. However, we have decided to retain the research questions presented at the end of the introduction, as they provide a clear framework for the study, guiding readers to understand the study’s objectives and the specific aspects of fishery biology we aim to address. These questions help establish the relevance of our findings and emphasize their importance in the context of fisheries management and population dynamics.   The following revisions were also made in accordance with your comments:   1. The introduction was refined to remove outdated references and incorporate more recent research findings. 2. The caption of Figure 1 was adjusted to remove bold formatting. 3. The literature review on the length-weight relationship was removed from the Materials and Methods section for better alignment with the study’s focus. 4. The referencing style was thoroughly reviewed and corrected to ensure consistency, including citations like Sadovy de Mitcheson & Liu, 2008, which were used correctly throughout the manuscript. 5. We ensured that the manuscript followed the journal’s author guidelines, including the addition of missing sections such as Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, and Authors’ Contributions. 6. The font and font size were standardized throughout the document. 7. The methodology section was revised for better coherence, ensuring that similar ideas were grouped into cohesive paragraphs and that all methodologies mentioned were reflected in the results section. |
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|  | **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)* |  |