

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_120026
Title of the Manuscript:	Food and Feeding Habits of Two Dominant Fish Species in Ureje Reservoir Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy>)

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"> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is important, since it gives a clue of what niche the fish species is exploiting.</p> <p>Suitable</p> <p>The results were not clearly stated nor was the conclusion.</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>ANOVA is stated but none of the variables were tested for any significant difference between the food items nor study sites. There are significant gaps that need filling; water quality, food in the environment considered as that in the fish gut.</p> <p>The references were too many; although the discussion was scanty.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It is, although there are considerable inconsistencies e.g., too long sentences and a lot of repetition</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>In the introduction you could have briefly reviewed what the 2 fish species feed on.</p> <p>Water quality measurement should have been included. In studying food and feeding habits; the water could be sampled for study of plankton in the water. This gives a verge to consider what's in the environment and what the fish had selected.</p> <p>The introduction needs a serious overhaul. Introduce food and feeding habits, next its importance, consider reviewing the feeding habits of these two fish species</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:	Carolyn Kerubo Guto
Department, University & Country	Technical University of Mombasa, Kenya