

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_99090
Title of the Manuscript:	Biosecurity in fish farming: Implementation of the HACCP system at the Djissoumakö Fish Farming Centre - urban commune of Siguiri
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>First, I would like to thank the journal for offering me the opportunity to evaluate an article that deals with the topic of biosecurity. Below I detail some considerations about the article.</p> <p>1. I think the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>2. As for the abstract, I suggest that the authors begin by showing the theme that will be discussed in the article, that is, biosecurity, emphasizing its importance. I also suggest showing the tools that will be used. Keywords are too broad. Imagine when you search, for example biosafety, how many scientific articles will appear. This same situation will occur with the word pisciculture.</p> <p>3. I suggest that authors explain in detail in the Materials and Methods subsection the population and sample under study.</p> <p>4. The "Discussion" subsection has some statements that are not the objective of the article and therefore, I suggest that they be eliminated. For example, "...This would have had consequences for the health of fish and staff"</p> <p>5. The subsection "Conclusion" happens the same as in the discussion of the results. For example, "...which undoubtedly has consequences in terms of productivity". What can the authors propose for companies to solve the current situation</p> <p>6. References are insufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It's adequate.	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Concepción Batiz
Department, University & Country	Brazil