

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJFAR_116396 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EFFECTS OF SMOKING DURATION ON THE PROXIMATE AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF SELECTED FISHES FROM LOWER RIVER BENUE, BENUE STATE, NIGERIA |
| Type of the Article | Research 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>1. The manuscript addresses an important gap in the current literature on “value addition in fish products”. It offers valuable insights into “value addition in fish products” which is of significant interest to the scientific community. However, it would be beneficial to emphasize the broader implications of the findings in the introduction to highlight its relevance to a wider audience.</p> <p>2. The title accurately reflects the content of the article; however, it could be more engaging and descriptive. Perhaps consider incorporating keywords that capture the essence of the study while piquing the interest of potential readers.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a succinct overview of the study objectives, methods, key findings, and implications. However, it could be enhanced by including more specific details about the methodology and results to give readers a clearer understanding of the study's contributions. Consider briefly summarizing the main findings in each section to provide a comprehensive overview.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, with clear subsections that logically organize the content. However, there may be room for improvement in the flow between sections to ensure a smooth transition from one topic to the next. Consider revising the transitions between subsections to improve coherence and readability.</p> <p>5. Overall, the manuscript appears scientifically sound, with well-supported arguments and evidence. However, there are a few instances where additional clarification or validation may be needed to strengthen certain claims. It is recommended to carefully review the methodology and results sections to ensure accuracy and rigor in the analysis and interpretation of data.</p> <p>6. The references cited in the manuscript are relevant and provide a solid foundation for the study. However, it would be beneficial to include more recent publications to demonstrate the currency of the research and to incorporate the latest findings in the field. Additionally, consider diversifying the sources by including studies from a broader range of journals and authors to provide a more comprehensive perspective on the topic.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and effectively conveys the research findings and arguments. The manuscript demonstrates a good command of academic language and adheres to the conventions of scholarly writing. However, some minor revisions may be needed for clarity and precision, as mentioned in the previous response. Overall, the language and English quality meet the standards expected for scholarly communication.</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: | Pranay Punj Pankaj |
| Department, University & Country | Nagaland University, India |