

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_130778
Title of the Manuscript:	Water Quality Assesment of Hashidu Reservoir Along River Gongola, Gombe State 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/>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is particularly important for an ecologically significant river where conservation issues are highly critical. The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the ecological status of the river based on the physicochemical parameter and will contribute significantly to policy making for its protection and sustainable management.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is really appropriate and descriptive	OK
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.	The abstract of the manuscript should be comprehensive and represents all sections of the manuscript (introduction, method, results, discussion, conclusion and recommendations) and can stand alone. Therefore, please revise and rewrite the abstract by including the introduction and discussion sections. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Introduction section: Introduce the significance of studying the relation between water quality and fisheries</li><li>• Discussion section: Compare the results with the standards for fisheries</li><li>• What is the nobility of the study?</li></ul>	Effectuated
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is statistically robust and technically sound: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Scientific and appropriate methods were applied in sampling and determining the water quality parameters</li><li>- the statistical analysis were performed appropriately</li><li>- Sound data presentation in table</li><li>- The conclusion is drawn appropriately based on the data</li></ul>	Revised
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are appropriate but needs to use citation tools like Mendeley (so that the references are generated automatically instead of manual insertion) Add few references that focus on previous similar studies in the study area (introduction section), to see the identified gap and the nobility of your study	Ok

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is no language problem, it is well written and presented in an intelligent fashion (except punctuation)	
Optional/General comments	<p>The ff comments and suggestions will contribute to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p><b>Introduction section:</b> Your objective was to study the relation of water quality with fisheries as indicated in the abstract; therefore, it is expected to describe the effect of water quality on aquatic organisms in general and on Fisheries in particular</p> <p>In this section it is expected to describe the research gap you want to fill or add knowledge. This can be possible when you review previous similar studies in the study are. This is the main drawback of the manuscript.</p> <p><b>Methodology section:</b> clear description of the sampling sites is required: you are expected to describe 'which part of the river is studied?' 'what criteria you have used to select the three sampling sites?' 'location/altitude, distance etc'</p> <p><b>Results and discussion section:</b> very interesting way of presenting your results in tables (the strength of the manuscript)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- You have described the spatio-temporal variation (variation across seasons and sampling sites) which is good but (if possible) check/test the difference is statistically significant or not!</li><li>- Please, discuss (compare and contrast) with similar studies (in the study area/river etc), describe the implications on the ecological status of the river etc.</li><li>- What is the possible cause for spatial variation in water quality (across the sites)?</li><li>- Site A, B and C: first they should be described in the method section</li></ul> <p><b>Conclusion and recommendation:</b> too short! Why?</p> <p><b>Acknowledgement:</b> no one to acknowledge?</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)	