

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_128590
Title of the Manuscript:	Aquatic Temperature and its Ecological Systems. A Review of Knowledge and Approaches for Studying Aqua-biota Responses, a beam on Niger Delta, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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: 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is a comprehensive review of aquatic temperature and its impact on ecosystems in the Niger Delta. It provides valuable insights into spatio-temporal variations, aqua-biota responses, and anthropogenic influences. It is relevant for researchers studying the effects of climate change and for aquatic resource managers, offering tools for assessing and protecting aquatic biodiversity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate, but can be adjusted for clarity. Suggestion: <i>"Aquatic Temperature Dynamics and Ecological Impacts: A Review with Focus on Niger Delta, Nigeria."</i>	
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.	The abstract is detailed, but includes some repetitions. I suggest condensing the introduction and more clearly highlighting the purpose of the paper and its key contributions.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, but some sections, such as the one titled "Anthropogenic Agenda," could benefit from synthesis to avoid redundancy. This section, while informative, presents ideas and concepts that are repeated or overly detailed. By condensing the content and focusing on the most crucial aspects, the section could become more concise and impactful. This would improve the overall readability of the manuscript, making it easier for readers to grasp the main points without being overwhelmed by repetitive information. Additionally, a clearer structure within this section could help emphasize the key arguments and avoid diluting the main message with excessive elaboration.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate, but some are outdated. I suggest including recent studies that explore the impact of climate change on similar ecosystems in other regions to provide a global perspective. This would enhance the manuscript by placing the findings within a broader context and demonstrating the relevance of the research beyond the Niger Delta. Comparative analyses with ecosystems from different geographical areas affected by climate change could also underline the universality of the challenges and enrich the discussion with additional insights or contrasting findings.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used is technical, but some sentences are overly long and could be simplified for better clarity. I recommend a stylistic revision to improve readability. Breaking down complex sentences into shorter, more direct statements would help convey the ideas more effectively. Some sentences are overloaded with incorrectly placed commas or punctuation that could be better utilized to clearly separate ideas. Reviewing and adjusting the punctuation would enhance the flow of the text and ensure that each idea is presented distinctly. In some parts of the manuscript, the placement of references makes the text harder to follow. Ensuring a consistent citation style throughout the paper is crucial for readability and professionalism. Some sentences contain subject-verb agreement errors, and verbs are occasionally used in incorrect forms. These issues can disrupt the flow of the text and detract from its professional tone. Careful proofreading and grammatical correction are necessary to ensure consistency between singular and plural subjects and their corresponding verbs. There are sections where ideas are repeated multiple times, leading to unnecessary redundancy.	
Optional/General comments	The paper addresses relevant topics but could benefit from additional illustrations (graphs, diagrams) to visually support the conclusions.	

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:	Stroe Maria Desimira
Department, University & Country	Romania