

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_121019
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the food and feeding habit of some selected fish species from Lower River Benue, Makurdi-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.	The title is interesting but the way of writing and structure of the manuscript are poor.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good and interesting	
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.	It is not comprehensive and it is large please focus on the main point of the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the paper is poor. But the Author are not used sections and subsection in the manuscript.	
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.	This study is written poorly please improve to increase the quality of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are cited in manually why not use medley or other. The references are not recent please use more current or recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please see again all the typos, grammatical error and punctuation errors.	
Optional/General comments	The general comments are: 1. Give the references of the subsection of Stomach Fullness Classification 2. The format of the references are written in the same format. Please see again all the format of the references. 3. The conclusion and the recommendation are limited please elaborate more.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Basaznew Belew Melak
Department, University & Country	Mekdela Amba University, Ethiopia