

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_109147
Title of the Manuscript:	Behavioral, biometric and oxidative stress alterations in <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> juveniles exposed to chlorpyrifos
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the article contributed to knowledge on the toxicology effects of chlorpyrifos on <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> juveniles and can be a source of reference to effects on public health</p> <p>The title is good but I am suggesting "Behavioral, biometric and oxidative stress-induced alterations in <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> juveniles exposed to chlorpyrifos</p> <p>The abstract is good. However, there is a disparity in sublethal dose in abstract (0.93 and 2.35 mg/L) and in methodology (0.47 and 0.93 mg/L)</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. However, in the methodology there are a lot of references that are over 30 years (e.g Lowry et al 1951 and Sharma & Krishna-Murti 1968) , can those be updated. Are there earlier methods that can be used for those calculations?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language is suitable but there are some grammatical errors, some of which I corrected in the manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is scientific and detailed. Nevertheless, the introduction needs to be corrected as there was no coherence. I made some corrections in the manuscript. Also, in the discussion, the author should compare the study specifically more with studies on the effects of chlorpyrifos or other organophosphate pesticides on fishes than with other types of pollutants.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Yemisi Tosin Aluko
Department, University & Country	Pan African University Institute of Life and Earth Sciences, University of Ibadan, Nigeria