

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97400
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of muscle proximate composition of six freshwater fish species and their nutritional value
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes I suggest rephrasing the title to be more synthetic: “Evaluation of muscle proximate composition and nutritional value of six freshwater fish species” Not really. I suggest to rephrase the abstract because there is a sentence without verb. An idea might be as follows: “Fish is an economically viable source of animal protein that is widely available even in rural areas, making it an easily accessible source of protein. The aim of the present study was to determine the proximate composition and nutritional value of 6 different freshwater species of fishes : <i>Oreochromis nitoticus</i>, <i>Labeo rohita</i>, <i>Ompok bimaculatus</i>, <i>Notopterus chitala</i>, <i>Channa striata</i>, and <i>Catla catla</i>. The study was conducted from March to September 2022. Nutritional and economic factors were taken into account in the selection of the fish types. According to our findings, dry fish has high-protein content and low-fat which can contribute greatly to children's as well as adult's recommended protein intake. Fish nutritional value varies significantly depending on the species, size, and age of the fish, but understanding the proximate composition of the fish can provide us with a general idea of its nutritional profile. The data that has been summarized could prove to be beneficial for further studies to determine how dry fish can be utilized effectively to combat malnutrition issues in India and also shares an insight into nutritional values of different fresh water fishes available in the Kalaburagi region.” Yes. I suggest correcting a lot of things which I will list below: Introduction -The authors state that “The four major biological constituents of muscle tissue (fillet) are water, protein, lipid, and ash, also called the approximate composition of fish.” Please provide values for the macronutrients and references. -Please name the references for “dried fish...” -please correct into “offer nutritious food to people worldwide” -please quote the reference for “placed 103rd out of 119 countries”. Sampling -please rephrase into “The study was conducted from March 2022 to June 2022 on 6 species of fish.” - Images of fish (Figure 1-8) - please remove them if they are not original and renumber the rest of the images. Methods -Please add the details of apparatus and equipment used in the experiment, like: producer, model, city and country, especially for centrifuge, spectrophotometer, Soxhlet, oven, muffle furnace. -Did you test any sample in replicates? If not, how are you sure that the results is the correct one? -Please detail FCR – Folin Ciocalteu Reagent Results - Please correct: “Proximate composition: The proximate composition of six freshwater fishes” -Table 2 is actually Table 1, because there is no other Table before it. Please correct it. Please add the title BEFORE the table. -Please delete Figure 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 – because they present very similar data to the one presented in the Table 2 (actually 1) and it is not recommended to duplicate the same results in the same paper. Besides, the Figures have black background and are 3D, which is NOT the way to present charts in scientific papers. - Please use italic font to for latin names of the fish in the end of the article “The lipid content of <i>Labeo rohita</i> is high compared to the other six fish species (Prakash et al., 2010). The carbohydrate content of <i>Oreochromis nitoticus</i> is high compared to the other six fish species.” The results were not discussed, not compared with other published data. 6.References Only 4 references out of 10 were recent (after 2018). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language can and must be improved and I have written above about it.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Laura Stan
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania