

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFAR_123333</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Study of the Nutritive and Elemental Composition of Smoked and Fresh Clarias gariepinus from three selected Fish Farms in Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study compares the nutritional quality and elemental composition of smoked and fresh samples of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> sourced from three farms located in Ado-Ekiti. The authors claim that the locality is a major centre of economic activities in Nigeria and consume <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> in fresh and smoked form (The regional importance of the findings are not overlooked, however the global relevance of the findings is questionable). Result showed that crude protein, the crude fat, ash, carbohydrate, and fibre content were higher in the smoked fish than fresh catfish samples (which is obvious). The authors also reported that the elemental composition of both smoked and fresh catfish were within the permissible limit of World Health Organisation (However, the document is not listed in the reference list). Apart from reporting the values in mean <math>\pm</math> SD format, the manuscript does not employ any sophisticated statistical analysis tools.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article very well summarises the overall findings, no addition is required</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, However, the materials and method section seems to be overblown. The section could be shortened by giving citations in the text and references as the procedure is well known to scientific community</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study compares the nutritional quality and elemental composition of smoked and fresh samples of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> sourced from three farms located in Ado-Ekiti. The authors claim that the locality is a major centre of economic activities in Nigeria and consume <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> in fresh and smoked form (The regional importance of the findings are not overlooked, however the global relevance of the findings is questionable). Result showed that crude protein, the crude fat, ash, carbohydrate, and fibre content were higher in the smoked fish than fresh catfish samples (which is obvious). The authors also reported that the elemental composition of both smoked and fresh catfish were within the permissible limit of World Health Organisation (However, the document is not listed in the reference list). Though the result of elemental composition of the fish indicates that the fishes farmed in the region are safe. Findings about the proximate composition is not new to the scientific community. Apart from reporting the values in mean <math>\pm</math> SD format, the manuscript does not employ any sophisticated statistical analysis tools.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	Yes, the references are sufficient. <b>However, since the authors are stressing on the WHO permissible limit for determining safety of the fish it is imperative to add this document in the reference.</b>	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<b>NIL</b>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nithin. C. T</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Institute of Fisheries Post Harvest Technology and Training, India</b>