

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	Research 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>In fisheries science, this manuscript is important with the following point</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It provides baseline information on the general well-being commercially important fishes in the Reservoir 2) Information from this study can be adopted for sustainable management of fisheries resources. 3) Information from this study can used as a background for future scientific research 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes the title is suitable.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract needs general modification</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is not really scientifically robust. The author(s) should do a thorough review the improve the content of the manuscript</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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:	Uduak Sylvanus Jacob
Department, University & Country	University of Uyo, Uyo, Nigeria