

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_104096
Title of the Manuscript:	SUPPLEMENTATION EFFECT OF DIETARY CARVACROL AND THYMOL POLYPHENOLS FROM OREGANO Origanum Vulgare ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND HEALTH CONDITION OF PACIFIC WHITE SHRIMP Litopenaeus vannamei.
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:

(<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well composed, comprehensive and innovative. It contains lots of information thereby making it important for scientific community</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>The subsections and structure are appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are perfect</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The English quality is suitable for scholarly communications except for some few tenses errors</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There are few discrepancies in the references</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bello Adunola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal Institute of Industrial Research, Nigeria</b>