

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_120515
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF THE NUTRITIONAL PROFILES OF WILD AND POND REARED CATFISH (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>) in Obubra LGA, Cross River State.
Type of the Article	Research Paper

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript presents important insights and valuable data on the nutritional composition of wild and pond-raised African Catfish (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>). The research offers a comprehensive comparative analysis of the nutritional elements of wild and pond-raised catfish. These informations can aid in developing improved diets and enhancing the overall quality of fish for human consumption. The results emphasize the advantages of pond-raised catfish in terms of higher crude protein, carbohydrate, and energy content. This information would be very essential for fish farmers and aquaculture industries to optimize feeding practices and improve the nutritional value of farmed fish. The research also addresses the impact of environmental factors and human activities on the nutritional profile of fish.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract is comprehensive. It could be revised for better clarity</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The paper appears to be scientifically correct. It appropriately compares the proximate composition of wild and pond-raised <i>Clarias gariepinus</i>, highlighting significant differences in protein, carbohydrate, and energy content. The methodology for sample collection, analysis, and statistical evaluation is clearly outlined, ensuring reproducibility and reliability. The conclusions drawn are consistent with the results presented, aligning with existing literature on fish nutrition.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>Yes Some references with missing details such as page numbers, volumes, and issues. Reference in text missing in bibliography Ayeloja <i>et al.</i>, 2012 Michael and Adedayo, 2017</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The entire paper requires thorough examination for alignment, spacing, font, and style.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Corrections marked in manuscript (in red)</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C. P. Anitha Devi
Department, University & Country	N. S. S. Hindu College, India