

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_98156
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Survey of Parasites of African catfish <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> (Burchell, 1822) in Ajiwa and Zobe Reservoirs in Katsina State, North-Western Nigeria
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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	1= the manuscript is important for scientific community because it provides new scientific informations about the endo and ectoparasites of african catfish in two reservoirs in Nigeria 2: no the title is not suitable because the name of the state in the title doesn't provide any scientific information ; Comparative Survey of Parasites of African catfish <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> (Burchell, 1822) in Ajiwa and Zobe Reservoirs in North-Western Nigeria 3: the abstract of the article is comprehensivebut must be corrected for a better understanding 4: no major suggestion 5: the manuscript is scientifically correct 6: the references are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Kpoumie Nsangou Amidou
Department, University & Country	Institute of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences The University of Douala, Cameroon