

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_95826
Title of the Manuscript:	FOOD AND FEEDING HABITS OF SCHILBE MYSTUS FROM THE LOWER RIVER BENUE AT MAKURDI
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>)

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. Incomplete abstract section. What is the purpose of this study, what parameters are studied, and are conclusions clear</p> <p>2. The introduction is too short and unclear. Add references that are appropriate for this research, what are the problems and solutions and what are the newest articles in this research</p> <p>3. The material and method sections are not clear. The number of fish samples was too small, and it is not clear what parameters were studied, what was the size of the aquarium, and how many treatments and repetitions were studied.</p> <p>4. The discussion section is not clear. Add new references according to this research and add to the results of the discussion according to the parameters of this research</p> <p>5. Inappropriate and unclear conclusions, make short and clear conclusions according to the results of this study</p> <p>6. Add a new reference and check the correct reference writing</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prayogi Sunu
Department, University & Country	Universitas Boyolali, Indonesia