Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJFAR_89312**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effectiveness of Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia Crassipes) And Water Spinach (Ipomoea Aquatica) to Reduce Nitrate and Phosphate Concentrations in Cimulu River Water, Tasikmalaya City**
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:

(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript presents "Effectiveness of Water Hyacinth (Eichhornia Crassipes) And Water Spinach (Ipomoea Aquatica) to Reduce Nitrate and Phosphate Concentrations in Cimulu River Water, Tasikmalaya City", which is quite interesting. The subject addressed is within the scope of the journal. However, the manuscript, in its present form, contains several weaknesses. Appropriate revisions to the mentioned points should be undertaken in order to justify recommendation for publication. Language should be revised. It has plenty of grammatical errors as well as sentence-structure mistakes. The title, abstract, keywords are not consistent with the main work of the study. Abstract should be informative and include the main findings. The authors could describe the experiment design rather than pass on to give direct results in abstract. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. To conclude, the basic idea was certainly interesting but the paper is highly confusing, the Material and Methods very debatable, the results do not support the conclusions. The manuscript is immature, both in terms of sentence construction and ideas. Moreover, the manuscript could be substantially improved by relying and citing more on recent literatures about contemporary real-life case studies on sustainability and/or water quality such as the followings: https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8454(2002)064<0284:NFOGSP>2.0.CO;2 https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8454(2001)063<0328:ASNBWS>2.0.CO;2 https://doi.org/10.1080/15275922.2020.1836074	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	**Yalçın Tepe**
Department, University & Country	**Turkey**