

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_104635
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of the Nutritional Composition, Fatty Acid Profiles and Organoleptic Evaluation of Clarias gariepinus (African catfish) and Oreochromis niloticus (Nile tilapia) raised under Wild and Pond-cultured Systems.
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper title abstract gives lack specific details about the methodology and the significance of the results. 2. the introduction could benefit from a more detailed literature review to justify the study's objectives and hypotheses further. 3. methodology lacks information on how the fish were raised in the pond-cultured system, including details about feed composition, water quality, and farming practices. 4. results section lack of statistical analyses and confidence intervals for key findings is a notable limitation. 5. the discussion could be strengthened by exploring potential reasons behind the observed variations, such as dietary differences and environmental factors. 6. limitations section could benefit from a more comprehensive discussion of potential confounding factors that could impact the study's outcomes. 7. conclusion section should include recommendations for future research and practical applications of the results, such as dietary guidelines for consumers and fish farmers. 8. some references cited in the text are missing from the reference list, and some reference formats need standardization. 9. incomplete information on pond-cultured fish farming practices and statistical analyses. 10. significance of the observed differences in nutritional composition, fatty acid profiles, and organoleptic evaluation between the two fish species is not fully addressed 11. the abstract lacks information about the sample size and the geographical location of the study, which could be important for contextualizing the findings 12. discussion could explore the potential impact of the observed differences on human health and the environment 13. paper should provide more information about the sensory evaluation process 14. discussion should elaborate on the reasons for the observed differences in taste, flavor, color, texture, and overall acceptability between wild and pond-cultured fish 15. study might not have used randomization in the sample selection process, leading to potential biases in the comparison between wild and pond-cultured fish 16. research might not have accounted for variations in farming practices, feed compositions, and water quality, which can influence the nutritional composition of fish 17. study might not have considered the potential impact of seasonal variations on the nutritional content and fatty acid profiles of the fish species 18. lack robust quality control measures, leading to potential inaccuracies in the analytical data 19. selectively report positive or significant results, while omitting negative or non-significant findings, leading to reporting bias 20. assessed the long-term sustainability of pond-cultured fish compared to wild fish, 	

Review Form 1.7

	considering environmental and economic factors 21. not have analyzed the specific diets of the fish species	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shyam R. Sihare
Department, University & Country	Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Government College, India