

## 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> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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>1. The article is appropriate, appropriately reflects the topic of the study, and is appropriate. It makes it clear that the goal of the study is to assess how different smoking techniques affect the nutritional value of shrimp.</p> <p>2. the title of the article suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article provides a brief overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. It covers the essential elements of the research.</p> <p>4. Very Good</p> <p>5. This article's scientific merit is respectable. A detailed analysis of the entire study—including the full methods, results, and discussion sections—would be required to gauge the manuscript's scientific soundness. Experts in the field who can judge the reliability and validity of the research techniques, the accuracy of the data analysis, and the interpretation of the findings should carry out this evaluation. In addition, it's crucial to take into account other elements that contribute to a manuscript's scientific accuracy, such as adherence to ethical guidelines, accurate citation of prior work, and general coherence and clarity in the study's presentation.</p> <p>6. The references are excellent; thus, kindly update and include paper years 2019 to 2023.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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>Theeranat Suwanaruang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kalasin University, Thailand</b>