

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_100790
Title of the Manuscript:	POLYCYCLIC AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS CONCENTRATIONS IN SMOKED AND FRESH CLARIAS GARIEPINUS FROM GOVERNMENT ASSISTED CLUSTERED FISH FARM, IKORODU, LAGOS STATE.
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.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><u>Compulsory</u> 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 manuscript is important for scientific community. But the author needs to improve on the writing out the results.</p> <p>2. The reviewer wishes to suggest a modification of the title as: Evaluation of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon concentrations in fresh and locally smoked fresh clarias gariepinus collected from Government-Assisted Clustered Fish Farm, Ikorodu, Lagos State.</p> <p>3. .</p> <p>4. The abstract is not comprehensive as the results were not presented, especially with the aim of the study in mind. The abstract needs to be improved. There are some suggestions already in the manuscript..</p> <p>5. 4. It is scientifically correct but needs more improvement.</p> <p>The author should search for more recent articles to add to the work</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The reviewer noticed some bias in the categorization of the fish by weight. Also, the study design was not properly explained by the author. In some of the write-ups, the author is presenting that he analyses individual fish, while in other places he is presenting a group analysis.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maikenti James Ishaku
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Lafia, Nigeria