

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJFAR_97887 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Physical and Chemical Variables of freshwater swamp ponds of Engenni, Ahoada-West, Niger Delta, Nigeria |
| Type of the Article | 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>The manuscript investigated the water quality of freshwater swamp ponds of Engenni, Ahoada-West, Niger Delta, Nigeria</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>References must be updated.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | yes | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>1-The Freshwater Quality Index (WQI) is a tool developed by scientists to help evaluate the quality of water in these streams and rivers. It summarizes large amounts of water quality data into a single "score" from 1 to 100. Higher scores reflect cleaner water. WQI should be calculated.</p> <p>2- It is wrong to calculate the mean for pH values. Used range only So . Fig 4 must be deleted</p> <p>3- The discussion section is insufficient, measured parameters can be compared to fresh water standard limits.</p> <p>4- Other parameters such as total dissolved organic matter, nutrients, total nitrogen, total phosphorus, total suspended matter should be concerned. They contributed to identify WQI</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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Name: | Safaa Abdel Salam Hassan Abdel Ghani |
| Department, University & Country | National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Egypt |