

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_103048
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of effects of smoking method on the nutritional value of shrimps: An evidence from different types of fuel
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> )

### ART 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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>“Assessment of nutritional composition of shrimps using different smoking method” can be better title if authors have no objection.</p> <p>No, as the authors have written the abstract haphazardly and the findings are contradictory when compared with the results and discussion. The authors mention that nutrients do not undergo any change by smoking but conclude the abstract with the suggestion of not using any kind of wood in the smoking of shrimps. It is confusing!!!!</p> <p>Review of literature having different sub-headings that too contradictory are not required and hence, should be deleted.</p> <p>Needs revision</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some grammatical errors need to be rectified before publication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Review of literature incorporated in the manuscript is contradictory when compared with the research findings. It should support the authors findings although review of literature is not required for the present study.</li> <li>➤ Methodology part should be simple and concise with appropriate headings and sub-headings.</li> </ul>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sajad Hussain Mir</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>