

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The objectives are found most suitable. The aim of sustainability in Nigeria's aquaculture is in urgent need of attention. Grammatical mistakes are there, after these minor correction, manuscript is recommended for publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The name of farm (Panyam fish farm) in the title is not fit, it's a result, title should be common THE COMMON CARP (Cyprinus carpio) FISH AQUACULTURE : REVITALIZATION, MULTIPLICATION AND SUSTAINABILITY IN NIGERIA	
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.	Yes One sentence of about 6 lines, need to be avoid, instead of that make small sentences	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Grammatical mistakes are there, after these minor correction, manuscript is recommended for publication. Grammatical mistakes are there, after these minor correction, manuscript is recommended for publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient, But most of the references are written short, should be correct it in revised manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammatical mistakes are there, after these minor correction, manuscript is recommended for publication. Specially, use of capital letters are more, and unwanted, grammatically most of wrong.	
Optional/General comments	Grammatical mistakes are there, after these minor correction, manuscript is recommended for publication.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Satam Sachin Bajirao
Department, University & Country	Marine Biological Research Station (DBSKKV), Maharashtra, India