



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_ACSj_18346
Title of the Manuscript:	Title Study of Physical and Chemical Composition and Quality of <i>Hoplias malabaricus</i> and <i>Leporinus friderici</i> (Bloch, 1794) Fillet Collected in the River Pirativa-Santana-AP
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	The English is missing , the author is making simple English mistakes that change the meanings of his writing more so in the introduction (the Brazil instead of in Brazil, data are important instead of data is important and so many more) In general the English is poor) No brief idea of the expected chemical composition and the fillets in the introduction The discussion should be more explaining results than comparing them compulsion just backs up man already explained point The conclusion should be a summary but not a repeatation of the discussion	- The English revision of the manuscript have been held. As regards the chemical composition and filleting have been included in the introduction as suggested by the evaluator. - Changes in the discussion and conclusion, suggested by the assessor, have been held
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The methods are not flowing well and the tense should always be in the past because the work is already done (line 73-74,78 and 79) 88 and 89 formulae should not be a copy and past	- The suggested changes were made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		