

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_120401
Title of the Manuscript:	Length-weight relationships and condition factor of three commercially important fish species from Roseires reservoir, Blue Nile, Sudan.
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There is no doubt the importance of knowing the relationship between length and weight of fish in the Blue River in Sudan, due to the most important types of economic fish in it, as well as the condition coefficient, which gives an indication of the extent of the vitality of the catch in the river.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Is the abstract of the article is suitable	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In fact, the research is scientifically weak in terms of scientific discussion and dealing with specialized topics, the condetion factor, as the basis for calculating it through longitudinal groups or monthly in general was not clarified. Unfortunately, the research is weak.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	It is preferable to read similar research before starting to write this research	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good English	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

Review Form 3

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:	Mohammed Gaber Desouky
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Egypt