

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_120974
Title of the Manuscript:	The Reproductive Biology of Auchenoglanis biscutatus and Protopterus annectens from Lower River Benue Wadata, Makurdi-Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript entitled 'The Reproductive Biology of <i>Auchenoglanis biscutatus</i> and <i>Protopterus annectens</i> from Lower River Benue Wadata, Makurdi-Nigeria' is a well-studied reproductive biology paper on important fish species (i.e. catfish and lungfish). Although details study on reproductive biology has been done for the two species, there is a lack of co-ordination between the two species reproductive study and future importance of the study should be clearly mention in the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the article title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Although the abstract part is well-written, still some modification is required in the abstract part to make it more comprehensive. Some suggestions are: In the beginning of the abstract, Kindly mention a line for the importance of the study and why the research have been taken into. Sentence2: Since it is an abstract, its not necessary to explain the methods here. At the end of the abstract: Kindly rewrite the sentence, giving more emphasis on the importance of such study. Additional comments were marked in the text, kindly check the attached file	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Few suggestion is marked in the text.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Although the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, a few modifications are required in the manuscript for the paper to be more scientifically and technically sound. All the comments has been marked in the attached text file. Starting from introduction to conclusion part. Kindly modify it accordingly for better understanding of the article by the readers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the references are not sufficient and the last recent reference cited is 2017, so the author need to cite more recent and more references in the article.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some of the sentences need grammatical correction. Kindly check the attached text file for modifications.	
Optional/General comments	All Additional comments were marked in the text, kindly check the attached file	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niti Sharma
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Inland Fisheries Research Institute, India