Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Biotechnology Journal International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJI_104030**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Characterization of fish oils and Fatty acid investigation from Mugil parsia fish.**
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.journalbji.com/index.php/BJI/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)**	The manuscript is important if properly written in food english The title is not suitable. An alternative title is suggested on the manuscript.click on it to see it The abstract is not comprehensive because of poor language construction. I have tried to show example of the manuscript. Just click on the abstract to see my suggestions They are appropriate It might be scientifically correct if well written in clear understandable English language The references are sufficient and to greater extent recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The English language is too poor for scholarly communications	
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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sabinus Oscar O. Eze**
Department, University & Country	**University of Nigeria, Nigeria**