

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_127387
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Smoking and Sun Drying on the Carcass Quality of Oreochromis niloticus (Linnaeus, 1758)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 will contribute to existing knowledge in fish preservation methods. The methods applied therein is crucial to communities with limited storage and preservation capacities. Moreso, it will re-emphasise the importance of accepting preservation methods that would reduce post- harvest loses in the many fishing communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Some points in the abstract should be removed to make it look more concise. For instance, 'A total sample of 40 <i>O. niloticus</i> were collected, 20 samples were smoked dried in a smoking kiln fueled by Tectona grandis and Cocos nucifera firewood while the remaining 20 were sun-dried. The products were analyzed for moisture, ash, crude protein, lipid, and fibre content'.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. But requires some adjustments in the materials and methods section.	
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.	The manuscript when properly presented has quality ideas to contribute towards fish preservation and reduction in the post-harvest loses in the aquaculture and fisheries industries.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient, and majority of them are very recent. But the not all references were cited in the text. There are 38 in text citations against 45 listed in the reference section. I would suggest that the author read how more on how methodologies are presented. As a suggestion, the article https://doi.org/10.31248/RJFSN2022.153 , will be a good help for structuring and sensory evaluation section.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I would recommend that the article be presented as short communication article. Author should review and edit the article. Avoid mixing the use of both British and American English as this was the case in the article. The methodology section was not properly written, references were not provided in M&M section, and methodological procedures were not clearly stated.	
Optional/General comments	I have provided some comments and asked some questions in review section within the article that would guide the author during revision.	

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:	Aloysius Chimezie Adibe
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria