



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_45024
Title of the Manuscript:	HELMINTH PARASITES OF GOBIES FROM TWO CREEKLETS OF THE NEW CALABAR RIVER, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript is quite interest and scientifically robust. The Authors should address the following comments: Abstract Check for gross grammatical and typographical errors. State the sample collected. Define ALL acronyms first before using them. Line 15. 389 not proper. Write in words first. Clearly differentiate the components of an abstract. It is muddled up here. Keywords: Use only those words that appeared on paper title and those critical to the study. Introduction Citations needed in Line 29 and 41. Line 56-58. It should capture manuscript title. Materials and Methods Line 71-71. Figure 1 needs a citation. Line 75. State the kind of sample collected. All methods used should follow a published work protocol or cite where the method (s) is adopted from. Check for gross grammatical and syntax errors. Statistical analysis should be separated. Create a sub-heading (Statistical Analysis). Results Table 1 is scattered from your work. Try and adjust it properly. Too much tables representing similar thing. I suggest you merge some together and try summarizing your result interpretations. Figure 2 and 3 don't seem clear. If not necessary, please expunge. Discussion Check for gross grammatical and typographical errors. Conclusion should have a heading on its own. Key findings should be stated here while you recommend in few statements after the conclusion.	Abstract: All corrections made in line with reviewers comment. Introduction: Citations added. Title of manuscript captured in the introduction. Materials and method: Fig 1 is cited Sample type stated in manuscript Errors have been addressed Statistical analysis created as a subheading Results: Table 1 adjusted. Tables are different Figs 2 and 3 show results of test for significant difference Discussion: Errors noted and corrected. Subheading created for Conclusion
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The authors did a wonderful discussion. Keep it up. References too are OK. Please ensure you follow Journal guidelines.	References according to Journal guidelines Thanks for commendation on the discussion

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>