

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_100127
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERISTICS OF CATFISH MEAT MEAL (Pangasius hypophthalmus)
Type of the Article	Short 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript was informative and interesting read, although some of the passages were not elaborated well.</p> <p>The title should include some info about the conditions under which the observation of characteristics was performed.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, in needs minor corrections in language. Subsection and structure is appropriate.</p> <p>Manuscript is ok at first glance, I would need to see elaborate methodology for the measurement of the characteristics in the section RESEARCH METHODS to be able to say if it is scientific. If detailed steps for the analysis are not provided it should not be considered scientific.</p> <p>References seem ok, format should be uniform.</p> <p>The manuscript needs general conclusion (some form of this was attempted under SUGGESTION, but it would be nice if we get more elaborate thought of the author(s).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is suitable, English is comprehensible. The thoughts of the author(s) need more precision and clearance. Part of the sentences used are obsolete, too long, or do not make a clear point on the discussed matter.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lozenka Ivanova
Department, University & Country	University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius", North Macedonia