

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_96600
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF FOOD ITEMS AND DIET PREFERENCE IN THE STOMACH OF <i>Synodontis obesus</i> (BOULENGER, 1898: SILURIFORMES, MOCHOKIDAE) IN THE LOWER CROSS RIVER, NIGERIA
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Acceptable</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Can be improved	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The diet of <i>Synodontis obesus</i> is important in this research. The authors are advice to provide information on the categories listed in the writing. As the journal cited in this manuscript consider old, thus, is good for author to provide information and justification.</p> <p>2. More new and current references should be included.</p> <p>3. Climate should not be one of the subtopic in the methodology.</p> <p>4. The methodology in 2.4 can be improved, as the weight of the samples, was measured after incubated in 10% formalin? What is the precaution steps to avoid false reading?</p> <p>5. "The samples were gotten directly from the fishermen on early arrival at cheaper prices or most times bought from the market women around the landing sites." – this information was not able to present 2.3 Collection to Fish sample.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Teo Swee Sen
Department, University & Country	UCSI University, Malaysia