

**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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 study is very important form my point of view because it help to conserve and manage the species of fish food items.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>SUGGESTION:</b> Food and feeding habit of some selected fish species from Lower River Benue, Makurdi-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 IT IS	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES THEY ARE	
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.	THE MANUSCRIPT FOLLWED THE CORRECT SCIENTIFIC TECHNIQUE AND IT LOOK SOUND TO ME.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	YES THEY ARE	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	SOME CORRECTION IS NEEDED TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE MANUSCRIPT	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I HIGHLY RECOMMEND THE MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's comment</b> <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:	Tahani Ali Hassan Elhaj
Department, University & Country	University of Bahri, Sudan