

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes such research inputs on fishes in relation to their health impact are indispensable.</p> <p>I prefer if the authors relook the title.</p> <p>The abstract shall present all information about the work done, methods followed and the noble findings obtained. The study design is not clear.</p> <p>They seem appropriate.</p> <p>The references are many but most of them are not recent. The authors must also give references of recent works reported.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not at all. The authors must get help from others in terms of the write-up of the manuscript. They must consult professionals in proof reading.	
Optional/General comments	The way the authors refer to other works in the body of the text shall be redone in a sound manner. The authors must give sound arguments of their work in the discussion part. The study design shall be redone. I have tried to make some corrections on the manuscript and the authors shall make the necessary corrections.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Solomon Genet
Department, University & Country	Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia