

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_95915
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF LENGTH-WEIGHT RELATIONSHIP OF <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (Nile tilapia, Cichlidae, LINNAEUS 1758) FROM QUA IBOE RIVER ESTUARY, SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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, the manuscript is very important for scientific community because the weight-length relationship is an important tool in studies of biology, physiology and ecology of fish, indicating conditions and allowing comparisons between growth from different populations</p> <p>No, I suggest as title of the article: LENGTH-WEIGHT RELATIONSHIP OF NILE TILAPIA <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (LINNAEUS, 1758) FROM QUA IBOE RIVER ESTUARY, SOUTHEASTERN NIGERIA</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive and clearly written</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct Yes, most of the references are sufficient and recent In the discussion, the first paragraph is too long. This paragraph should be divided into several paragraphs so as not to make the text tiresome for the reader. In addition, in the manuscript many citations are not included in the references and vice versa. This detail must be corrected. Finally, the references must be standardized</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	The purpose of the article is showed and state explicitly with the article title. Apart from this, the paper is clearly written and well organized in topics	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jean Michel Corrêa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Ceará, Brazil