



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_44374
Title of the Manuscript:	Population dynamics of metazoan parasites of <i>Rhizoprionodon acutus</i> from Nellore Coast off Bay of Bengal.
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keywords should never repeat words already in the title. Replace "Population dynamics, metazoan parasites, <i>Rhizoprionodon acutus</i>". 2. Fig 1 and its caption are not clear. Figure Captions should explain the image without any need to read the manuscript, should be comprehensible by itself. The area in beige is the Nellore District, I imagine and which symbol represents the fish landing centers? It is necessary to rewrite the caption and detail the explanation about the map. 3. Line 63- sex is not a morphometric characteristic. You can say: Before dissecting the fish, individuals were sexed, weighed and the length was measured... 4. Line 67-71. Long sentence, should be separated. If you choose to keep the long sentence, check for punctuation missing and verbal tense (shall use past, not present). 5. Line 73- Physiological saline solution 6. Line 93-98. Format formula. 7. Line 126. Aach annual... each? 8. Table 1. Same thing as mentioned about image caption (item 2). The information must be complete. 9. Please, mention in the section "methodology" which months are grouped in each season. 10. In the significance statement it is mentioned that this study demonstrates the hole of temperature in parasitic infestation however, the result in this manuscript evidence the seasonal variation in parasitic infestation and indicate the hole of temperature. To better understand the hole of temperature in this process, it would be necessary to measure water temperature and air temperature in sampled areas, which is not the case of this study, in which sharks were acquired in markets 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: Add the article THE- Population dynamics of metazoan parasites of <i>Rhizoprionodon acutus</i> from the Nellore Coast off Bay of Bengal. 2. Line 29- "These aquatic parasites...". These should refer to something already mentioned and you did not mention aquatic parasites before. You can replace by the. 3. Line 38- After the species name, you should mention Author and year. You already did so in the abstract but should do the same in the manuscript. 4. Line 48-49- "... certain environmental factors...". Which factors? Should mention them here. 5. Why did you use formalin to preserve copepods and isopods? Could use alcohol 70%. Just curious. Besides, samples preserved in alcohol can be easily used to molecular 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>analysis.</p> <p>6. Since the text has subheadings, some kind of differentiation between headings and subheadings should be applied or they should be numerated.</p> <p>7. Mean abundance is rarely used in parasitology and when it is the case, there is strong reasons for that. Means intensity is the most used evaluation. Is there any specific reason to use both?</p> <p>8. Line 135- "5 species..." – When it is in the beginning of a sentence, you shall write the number.</p> <p>9. Line 136-137. "...comprising 6 cestodes, 2 nematodes, 1 Monogenean, 1 copepod and 1 isopod."</p> <p>10. Line 154. Shows? Shouldn't it be: Showed the lowest values?? Reaches? Shouldn't it be: Reached higher values?</p> <p>11. I was lead to think about this phenomenon in the summer of 2014, with no parasites infecting the sharks that were examined. Is it possible that any factor as source of sharks or adequations in the methodology to remove parasites could explain this absence?</p> <p>12. Graphics quality could be improved.</p> <p>13. English writing and punctuation could be improved as well. Actually, specially in the results section, some problems related to English translation might cause misunderstandings. I decided not to mention each specific point because they are numerous.</p> <p>14. Add references DOI whenever it is possible.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The subject is very interesting. The methodology employed is correct and traditional in parasitology studies. The manuscript has great merit and I encourage its publications. However, the author should consider the comments above and some improvements are needed. Additionally, great care shall be taken regarding conclusions. The data collected in this study allow a descriptive evaluation of parasitism dynamics and just indicates the possible effect of temperature.</p>	

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:	Tainã Gonçalves Loureiro
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil