

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_95510
Title of the Manuscript:	Composition of Flavour Non Volatile Compound Steamed Milk Fish (<i>Chanos chanos</i>)
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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. YES</p> <p>2. The title is suitable; however, it is not clear. The author may consider restructuring the title to read as follows: Composition of non-volatile flavour compounds contained in steamed milk fish (<i>Chanos chanos</i>)</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive. It may confuse the readers of this article. For example, the author is using Milkfish in his topic but in the abstract, he used Snakehead fish. This has to be corrected or justified. In addition, the abstract does not indicate how many fish (or the quantity of fish) were used and how many treatments were there. This is very important for the readers to understand the sample size that led to conclusion(s) of this study.</p> <p>4. NO. Some subsections lack information. For instance, in the methodology I expected the author to indicate which experimental design was used. Rather, he just said the research method used was <i>Experimental method</i> to me this does not make sense scientifically. In addition, on data analysis: why did the author decide to define what a comparative descriptive research is? This is not necessary in a scientific article. The author was supposed to describe how data was analysed. The conclusion is not well written since the author just repeated what he presented in the results section.</p> <p>5. YES, but it should be improved in the areas mentioned</p> <p>6. YES</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not really. The author should choose either British English or American English when writing some spellings. For instance, Flavor and Flavour. Consistence is needed. Grammar has to be checked as well, most of the tenses are not well written.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Steven Richard Mussah
Department, University & Country	Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Malawi