

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101744
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Chromium (VI) on haematological parameters in freshwater food fish, <i>Channa punctatus</i> (Bloch. 1793)
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript presents original research with vital information for the research community. - A change in the title is suggested to read; Effects of Chromium (VI) on haematological parameters of <i>Channa punctatus</i> (Bloch. 1793) - Certain values from the results need to be presented in the abstract. - All subsections are appropriate. - WBC was presented as part of the parameter, however, no values nor graph was presented. - ANOVA was said to have been carried out, but no mention as to the significant difference observed. Data analysis need to be explained. - The discussion is scanty. Author(s) should work more on it. The mechanism behind high values of MCV and MCH obtained when compare with the control (and even other related study), need to stated clearly. - Percentage mortality was mentioned in the conclusion, but it was not recorded in the results. - Conclusion need to be re-written – author should avoid mentioning aspect not included in the study. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Few sentence have to be checked for error. However, the English is okay.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes. And no mention as to whether of ethical clearance by the author(s).</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	I. O. Obaroh
Department, University & Country	Kampala International University, Uganda