

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_102808
Title of the Manuscript:	VOLATILE FLAVOR COMPONENTS AND AMINO ACID PROFILE OF STEAMED INDIAN MACKEREL (<i>Rastrelliger</i> sp.)
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>)

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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. The work addresses a very interesting topic, there are enough data to support the conclusions of the paper.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references could be improved, it is only one recent reference (from 2023), all the other references are before 2017.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please make the following corrections:</p> <p>On pages 1 please use the same notation for all the numbers: 3.74% instead of 3,74%; 23,678,573.15 instead of 23.678.573,15; 1,514,995.71 instead of 1.514.995,71;</p> <p>On page 2 is "carried out by Guillen & Errecalde [11]." instead of "carried out by [11].".</p> <p>On pages 5 please use the same notation for all the numbers: 3.74% instead of 3,74%; 2.41% instead of 2,41%; 2.38% instead of 2,38%; 2.08% instead of 2,08%.</p> <p>On page 6 is "Compounds that have" instead of "Compound that have".</p> <p>On page 6 is "glutamic acid which commonly contributes" instead of "glutamic acid which commonly contribute".</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:	Iorga Mirela Ioana
Department, University & Country	Romania