

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_75522
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF ADDITION TILAPIA SKIN COLLAGEN CONCENTRATION TO LOTION CHARACTERISTICS
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The article is simple but highlight very important use of waste generated out of Tilapia fish. The cosmetic use of collagen has been well illustrated with respect to its addition in lotions. However, there are serious revisions in the articles which needs to be addressed before acceptance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In title, the word ADDITION should be used in appropriate form to relate with the effect.</li> <li>2. Abstract should be structured as per the author guidelines.</li> <li>3. Tilapia scientific name should be mentioned.</li> <li>4. Last sentence in the "Introduction" should be reframed to get clarity.</li> <li>5. Procurement of Tilapia fish skin and its identification needs to be mentioned.</li> <li>6. Makes of instruments used and chemical grades with make should be mentioned in Tools and Materials.</li> <li>7. In Research Methods, the reason and/or reference for choosing 7% as highest concentration needs to be mentioned, since 7% was considered as best concentration. What happened or will happen beyond this concentration is not well understood.</li> <li>8. All experiments, results and discussions should be written in past tense.</li> <li>9. In 2.3.1, size of fish skin cuttings should be mentioned.</li> <li>10. In 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, standard units of hours, minutes should be used.</li> <li>11. In 2.3.2, the ± sign is not required in many places.</li> <li>12. In all figure, indicate "Different characters indicate significant differences" if there is significant difference between different concentration groups.</li> <li>13. Title of 3.3 and vertical axis legend in Figure 3 need to be revised.</li> <li>14. P value needs to be mentioned wherever significant or not-significant words are used to describe the results as per the author guidelines.</li> <li>15. Revise title 3.5</li> <li>16. Revise first line of 3.5.1</li> <li>17. Revise 3.5.3, translation not done.</li> <li>18. Results and Discussion on spreadability parameter are missing.</li> <li>19. In 3.6, the reference for accepting the alternative values and highest priority for 7% lotion and 0% lotion needs to be given along with justification for the difference in values for both</li> <li>20. Add DOI wherever available in the reference list.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Space after each complete sentence needs to be checked for uniformity.</li> <li>2. The units, v/v, w/v, etc. should be used uniformly throughout the paper.</li> <li>3. In Table 1, decimal may be used instead of comma</li> <li>4. Uniform or significant figure based decimal system should be followed throughout the article.</li> <li>5. The Figure and Table references within the running text should be uniformly written.</li> <li>6. Reference numbers should be given as per their appearance in the text.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whole text needs spell check and grammar check.</li> <li>2. Give full forms of non-standard terms</li> </ol>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**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>Sandeep Bhagwan Chavan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bharatiya Sanskriti Darshan Trust's Integrated Cancer Treatment and Research Centre, India</b>