

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_126354
Title of the Manuscript:	PANYAM FISH FARM FOR COMMON CARP (Cyprinus carpio) FISH AQUACULTURE REVITALIZATION, MULTIPLICATION AND SUSTAINABILITY IN 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: 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1- There is a constantly increasing demand for fish and fish products for human consumption. 2- There is an economic value of Common Carp has increased with the increased growth rate in terms of length and weight, high meat yield, non-selective habitat use, tasty meat and production availability in fish farms. 3- Common Carp are frequent due to its tolerance to changeable environmental conditions	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Very suitable	Noted
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.	Comprehensive	Done as suggested
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is coherent and excellently written with consistency.	Okay
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Recent	Noted
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, with acceptable quality of writing	Noted
Optional/General comments	Great efforts were exerted in this manuscript	

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>	