

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_95916
Title of the Manuscript:	SIZE STRUCTURES, LENGTH-WEIGHT RELATIONSHIPS AND CONDITION FACTORS OF <i>Synodontis obesus</i> (BOULENGER, 1898: SILURIFORMES, MOCHOKIDAE) IN THE LOWER CROSS RIVER, NIGERIA
Type of the 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)	1- The current study dealt with an important physiological and economic aspect 2- The title of the article is suitable. 3- The aim of the study was mentioned . 4- The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. 5- The subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate. 6- The researcher did not succeed in mentioning the references clearly	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	To some extent	
Optional/General comments	The current study dealt with an important economic aspect. However, references are not clearly mentioned in that manuscript, which led to a clear weakness in the manuscript.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kadhim Jawad Lafta Al-Zaidy
Department, University & Country	University of Al-Qadisiyah, Iraq