



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_14413
Title of the Manuscript:	Seasonal occurrence of <i>Gymnodinium catenatum</i> and Paralytic shellfish Poisoning in the Mediterranean shore of Morocco
Type of the 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	Some general improvements need to be carried out as in the following examples (although I marked some lines, a thorough review is strongly necessary): Correct units: ml to mL (like in the line 93: 200 ml to 200 mL or in the line 216: 1010 cells L⁻¹ to 1010 cells L⁻¹) Correct spacing between word like in the: lines 125, 126, 127, 128 (because there were too many spacing errors, please review it thoroughly the whole manuscript. Dots in wrong place: line 130. Review English writing as in the line 349 and 350. Citation are necessary to lines: 34, 40, 304, 316. Paragraph of line 323. Methods: When was the sampling? Jan 2010 to Jan 2012 (Specify in the Methods and no needs in the Results). Which mussel was sampled? Describe better the sampling location: is it a natural mussel growing place? A rocky shore or in the beach? Results: There is no results for background values nor of the cell counting either PSP in the tissues. Please emphasize which values were the thresholds for cell counting and for PSP in the tissue for showing the results in the Figure 2. Emphasize in the legend the y-scales are not the same for the figures a, b and c. Please correct the time spacing in the x-axis of figure 2a, 2b and 2c. For Figure 2a, the graphical spacings are completely different from the time intervals: 8 days, 13 days, 14 days and 8 days although the space between	It has been corrected. It is mussel aquaculture place in open waters. Corrected The lack of samples in some days and some weeks was due



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the date are the same. The spacings between samples in the figure 2b are 8 days, 2 days, 6 days and 7 days; and for Figure 2c are 14 days, 7 days, 14 days, days, 7 days, 14 days, 7 days, 8 days and 6 days. These differences in the sampling frequency cannot allow the conclusion in the line 148/149 saying that there is a time lag between the maximum concentration of the <i>G. catenatum</i> and the maximum PSP detection in the mussels tissue. There are 13 days of lack of data between samplings of the dates 12/01/2010 and 25/01/2010 and 14 days of lack of data between the dates 25/01/2010 and 08/02/2010. Such lack of data (of nearly two weeks) does not allow to conclude that there is a time lag of two weeks because one cannot say what happened in between whether it had smoothly/sharply decreased from the previous date or there had been an increase and then decrease. The time resolution is not enough to conclude about two weeks time lag between the two parameters analysed. Please describe better the Figure 2b. There is no proportionate evolution in the cell counting and the PSP in the tissue in the Figure 2b as described in the paragraph beginning in the line 200 nor one can say that there is a shift of one week during the decline phase since sampling lag is about 6 days. It is strongly recommended that the whole monitoring data be presented graphically OR cited in the text about the evolution and development of the cell concentration and the PSP accumulation in the mussel tissue (the background values or thresholds/and why these thresholds). It is important to emphasize whether the authors had checked in the samples for other species with higher concentrations at the time of the increase in the PSP toxins in the mussel tissues. Then the authors can conclude that the PSP toxins increase coincide with high concentrations of <i>G. catenatum</i>, even though the Figure 2 does not present same pattern in the evolution of <i>G. catenatum</i> concentration and PSP toxins in the mussel tissue.	to the problem of weather. There's no other species in the same area.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The article does attend the specifications of International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review as an original research paper after some compulsory revisions. Although its novelty and regional importance for presenting results of more than two years of monitoring of cell counting of the dinoflagellate <i>Gymnodinium catenatum</i> and linking it to the Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning (PSP) in a growing bivalve mussels area, the article needs big improvements for publishing it as a scientific paper as indicated specifically below. Although there are needs of some big corrections to accept as an original research paper the authors are strongly recommended to review it following recommendations below and allow its publication because of the importance of two years of monitoring this kind of data. I believe these data need to be published however it is absolutely necessary to make it at international standard for scientific paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		