

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_112080
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRITIONAL AND CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF FRYING, SMOKED DRIED, FREEZING SOLAR DRIED AND SALTING OF AFRICAN MUD CATFISH
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment This Journal article is neither scientifically robust nor technically sound.	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)	 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. The title is not very suitable- PROXIMATE AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF AFRICAN MUD FISH PRESERVED BY FRYING, SMOKING, FREEZING, SOLAR DRYING AND SALTING METHODS 3. Abstract is comprehensive but the results and conclusion presented therein are not of acceptable, because they are not exact values observed from the write-up. 4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. No, I do not think that this manuscript is scientifically correct. The Statistical analytical methods given are not appropriate, statistical package used and mean separation method are not given shown and not stated. The 2 Tables do not show the Standard Error of mean (SEM) values. 6. The References are not sufficient and insufficient References from Journal articles were cited.	Okay
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 1. English quality of this article is suitable, but not enough technical knowledge of the work was demonstrated.	
Optional/General comments The Journal write-up need to be more maturely written and the Results and Discussion, Conclusion done with references to previous Journal articles.		

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)	