

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_83353
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOMETRIC CHARACTERISTICS AND CONDITION FACTORS OF <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> AND <i>Hepsetus odoe</i> FROM THREE MAJOR RESERVOIRS OF EKITI- STATE, SOUTHWEST NIGERIA
Type of the 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://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This study was trying to evaluate and provide both morphometric and meristic characters of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> and <i>Hepsetus odoe</i> from selected three reservoirs of Nigeria. In addition, authors have analyzed the condition factor which indicates the well-being of the fish in a particular ecosystem or habitat. These kinds of studies are needed to understand the condition of the species especially such as commercially targeted species. Hence, the finding of these types of characters are important to the understanding of the current status of fish including the ecosystems. This study is on a topic of relevance and general interest to the readers of the journal and found that the paper is overall well in approach including the arrangement. I felt confident that the authors performed the first time of this kind of study to these three reservoirs.</p> <p>However, On the other hand, I found the writing style of this manuscript is not well written including many spelling mistakes. Therefore, I would recommend checking the manuscript in the English language with a native speaker. In addition, I noticed a lack of focus on the objectives of the study while the description of some very important points was inadequate or completely missing.</p> <p>Further, I have little confidence in some important analyses and came away with many questions to be able to recommend this paper for publication as it stands. Therefore, I recommend that a major revision is warranted on this manuscript as a minireview. I explain my concerns in more detail below. I ask that the authors specifically address each of my comments in their responses.</p> <p>Major comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. I have several significant concerns about the introduction. One of the concerns about the introduction part of the manuscript which better to justify and focus the study on the topic without describing unwanted matters out of the topic. Rearrange the introduction by focusing on the morphometric and meristic characters and shift this into the beginning. Remove all other things and revise all these and put them after this section. I would recommend you to rewrite the introduction part relevant to the topic and objectives of the study in a comprehensive way.</li><li>2. In the materials and method section, if authors could use a suitable map that clearly indicates the selected reservoirs of the study areas in a descriptive way, it would provide more value to the paper and readers will get a clear idea about the study area. Please provide the correct way of location. In addition, please provide how did you measure the lengths of the fishes with instrumental details with error?</li><li>3. Results and discussion sectionthere should be a clear way of representing data proper way. Data representation is not in a good way and I have seen many unclear figures and graphs which should not be included as it is into the manuscript. When mentioning the statistical analysis data authors have to think about interpretation of those details in a proper way. Also, the table representation of the study is not in a satisfactory level, please reformat those in a proper way. Furthermore, data interpretation is not in a satisfying level. I did not notice a comprehensive discussion relevant to the manuscript's topic</li></ol>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>and its less and required more details constructive discussion to emphasize the importance of the study. Further, authors should be able to justify their study and how it would be providing effectiveness with other existing data providing uniqueness.</p> <p>4. In the abstract and conclusion, the abstract is well in format however, the abstract and conclusion should be rewritten according to the topic and objective of the paper after revised the suggestions and comments.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Minot comments and suggestions are provided with the manuscript with track changes.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Please recheck the authors guidelines provided by journal and try to rearrange whole manuscript according to the suggestions provided.</p>	

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:	H. K. S. De Zoysa
Department, University & Country	Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka