

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_98195
Title of the Manuscript:	Fatty Acids, Lipid Quality Indices and Antioxidant properties of Some Small Indigenous Fishes of Manipur, India under Indo-Burma Biodiversity Hotspot Region
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.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, the manuscript is very important for the scientific community as it explores the nutritional quality of under-eaten fish.  2. Yes, the title is in accordance with what was investigated in the work.  3. The abstract should be improved in relation to the abbreviations that appear and also the cited fish species.  4. Yes, structures and subsections are adequate for the manuscript.  5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct.  6. Yes, the references are sufficient and relatively recent.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The writing is not adequate, commas and periods are missing, standardization in the entire manuscript. In many cases entire sentences are almost incomprehensible and also the acronyms must be revised.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roberta da Silveira
Department, University & Country	UEM, Brasil