

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_95444
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Moringa Leaf Extract as a Natural Preservative against Deterioration of Tilapia Fillet Quality Based on Organoleptic Characteristics
Type of the Article	Short 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>I consider the manuscript is importance for those who work food preservation.</p> <p>I suggest valuing the change by: "Moringa leaf extract as a natural preservative against the deterioration of tilapia fillet during room temperature storage".</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript has a correct structure and very good experimental design</p> <p>The references are sufficient, but I believe that the list of references should be updated, prioritizing those of the last five years (50% of the total references)</p> <p>Introduction. - I suggest that you synthesize it a bit because it is somewhat long. A lot of data is provided that is necessary.</p> <p>Results and Discussion. – - I think it is more didactic to place the figures immediately after being mentioned in the text. -The titles of the figures must explain <i>per se</i>, the content of this, without having to consult the text. For example. Fig. 1. Average appearance of tilapia fillets stored in room (25°C-28°C) temperatures.</p> <p>References. - The title of the journals must be abbreviated according to the international nomenclature.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is a very well done job with important contributions for the conservation of tilapia fillets</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jesús G. Rodríguez Diego
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, México