

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_119815
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MORPHOMETRIC AND MERISTIC CHARACTERS IN OREOCHROMIS NILOTICUS (NILE TILAPIA) FROM DIFFERENT ECOLOGICAL ZONES OF NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because it provides valuable insights into biodiversity, fisheries management, environmental impacts on fish morphology, genetic studies, and adaptation strategies of <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> across different ecological zones. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the study, focusing on the comparative analysis of morphometric and meristic characters of <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> across different ecological zones in Nigeria. However, an alternative title could be: "Comparative Morphometric and Meristic Analysis of Nile Tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>) Across Diverse Ecological Zones in Nigeria" 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. It mentions the number of samples, the specific lakes studied, the types of characters measured, the statistical methods used, and the main results and implications. If any improvement were needed, it might be to more explicitly state the practical implications or potential applications of the findings in a concise manner. However, overall, the abstract effectively summarizes the study. 4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript appear well-organized and follow a logical progression typical of scientific research articles in the biological sciences. The Introduction effectively sets the stage by providing essential background on African cichlids and outlining the study's objectives. The Materials and Methods section is detailed, covering study area descriptions, sample collection methods, and measurement protocols comprehensively. Results are presented clearly in the Results section, summarizing morphometric and meristic data with appropriate statistical analyses. The Discussion section interprets findings in relation to existing literature, highlighting environmental influences and potential implications. Overall, the manuscript provides a coherent narrative from introduction through to conclusion. To enhance readability, consider briefly summarizing key findings at the beginning of each section and ensuring consistent formatting throughout the manuscript for a smoother flow of information. 5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript is scientifically correct with minor improvements needed in the clarity and organization of some sections. 6. The references appear to cover relevant literature on African cichlids and morphometric studies. For completeness, ensure recent studies within the last 5 years are included to strengthen the manuscript's current relevance and depth of discussion. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Based on the provided excerpt, the language and English quality of the article seem generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are some areas where clarity and conciseness could be improved for better readability and understanding.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Paravanparambil Rajakumar Jayachandran
Department, University & Country	King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, India