

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_119262
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of water quality on the zootechnical (biological) performance of Clarias gariepinus at different stages of development in some fish farms within Fako Division, South West Region of Cameroon
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The findings add greatly to the understanding of aquaculture management in Cameroon, stressing the importance of water quality in fish farming success. To enhance clarity and avoid redundancy, the title could be slightly modified. I suggest, "Impact of Water Quality on the Growth Performance of Clarias gariepinus in Fish Farms within Fako Division, Cameroon" This version removes the redundancy of "Zootechnical (Biological) Performance" and uses "Impact" instead of "Influence," which might be slightly more assertive. Briefly mentioning the current state of aquaculture in the Fako Division or highlighting any specific challenges faced in this region could provide additional context. The subsections and overall organization of the text seem adequate and adhere to accepted scientific writing practices. A coherent presentation of the research is made possible by the logical progression from the introduction to the conclusion. It is imperative that every component is comprehensive and offers sufficient information to facilitate replication and a clear comprehension of the study's importance. The methods are sound, the data is accurately presented, and the conclusions are logically derived, thus, the manuscript can be considered scientifically correct. The manuscript includes a reasonable number of references that are pertinent to the study. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Consider revising the title to better reflect the specific focus of the study. Methodological rigor is evident but could be enhanced with more detailed descriptions. Data presentation is clear; however, additional visualization tools could aid interpretation.</p> <p>Follow the journal format as required.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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:	Marvin D. Mayormente
Department, University & Country	College of Engineering and Technology, Ifugao State University, Philippines