

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_90448
Title of the Manuscript:	Water Quality Of Cilutung River Sumedang Regency, West Java
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:

(<https://www.jurnalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The writing in the manuscript is weak. As well as the paper hasn't been written in an academic way. 2. One of the most common criticisms of the study is that it took a sample of just one season. It would have been better if the researchers had taken a sample of multiple seasons to validate the results. 3. The study did not do data analysis. This meant that the data was not analyzed to see if it was reliable or not. <p>Find Mean ± SE or Mean ±SD, and P Value, for significant or not</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title the word (of) should be in small letter. 2. In the abstract part no need to write (Place and Duration of Study) like that already have been written. 3. 276 mgL-1, this type of writing is wrong 4. Abstract part rewrites a lot of mistakes in spelling. 5. line 11, this is wrong (According to [1] the river, should be written (According to Rafi'i and Maulana [1]..... 7. Line 31-32, should be uniform capitalize each word: parameters (temperature, light transparency, <i>Total Suspended Solid</i> , <i>Total Dissolved Solid</i>), chemical parameters (pH, Dissolved Oxygen, COD, nitrate, ammonia). 8. In line 47, be careful regarding dot, and space: (of 2021 . To assess). 9. In line 52, Rewrite phrase: (Figure 1. Map of Water Quality Research Location) 10. Table 1, for references they wrote is wrong 11. Line 56, why it became italic, (on <i>purposive sampling</i>). 12. Line 62, data analysis, the data should be analyzed, and find Mean ± SE or Mean ±SD, P Value, for significant or not 13. Line 77, could you provide us by picture from study area 14. Line 112, what do you mean WIB as shown below? 15. 1The water temperature measurement was carried out from 10.00 WIB to 14.00 WIB. 6. Line 217, the quality of writing references is wrong: (including eutrophic waters [6]. [18]) 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samiaa Jamil Abdulwahid Kurdi
Department, University & Country	Soran University, Iraq