

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_108746
Title of the Manuscript:	Artificial Spawning Techniques for Catfish (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>) at the Cultivated Fisheries Production Business Service Center, Karawang
Type of the Article	Case study

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of</p>	<p>1) In these times where demand for fish supply is burgeoning and scientists are seeking innovative artificial spawning techniques that can benefit commercial fish farmers, I find this study relevant to the scientific community.</p> <p>2) The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3) The abstract of the manuscript is detailed, although there are use of ambiguous terms which I have highlighted in the manuscript.</p> <p>4) Structure of the manuscript is appropriate as it followed the Introduction, methodology, results/discussion and conclusion sequence. However, the subsections in the methodology/ result section are not properly arranged in a way that makes for easy understanding and connection of one step/ result to the next. Typically, a science paper is prepared in a manner, such that a proceeding step/ result comes after the preceding ones. That way, the readers can link the processes/ result and can as well, replicate the study if they wish.</p> <p>5) No, the manuscript is not scientifically correct. Firstly, the methodologies were reported in present tenses instead of past tenses. Also, methodology section was majorly a description of standard processes, rather than the actual experiments done. The result section is heavily laden with mere description and definition of terms and not actual results obtained from the study. Most of these I have highlighted in the manuscript.</p> <p>6) The references are sufficient, but about 50% of references are outdated (\geq ten years ago). Furthermore, references are poorly formatted. Some years come after authors' names (e.g., ref. #1-25), some years are put at the end (e.g., ref #26-27, 30). Authors' initials are not consistently written. Format of publication date is not consistent through the manuscript.</p> <p>Additional comments: (a) I suggest that the author removes the section on primary and secondary data collection as I do not find it relevant in this study.</p> <p>(b) No evidences were presented for some results, for instance on pest infestation in the pond. Without this, it may appear that the author did not carry out the study. I suggest the author include these results or remove this aspect from the manuscript if there are no results.</p> <p>c) It is important to include in the methodology section how the suitable hormone for the catfish species was determined (making reference to a previous study or some standard protocols should suffice). Also, how was the dose of administration determined? In most</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>cases, this is influenced by the fish species, their physiological status, age, weight etc.</p> <p>d) I suggest the results of fecundity, fertilization rate, hatching rate, larvae rearing and survival rate be also put in a table.</p> <p>e) Some wrong word usage and unscientific terms was observed. For instance;</p> <p>“Sangkuriang catfist boast five---” could be put as “Sangkuriang catfish possesses five---”.</p> <p>“spawning process for catfish comprise the catfish themselves” What does this mean?</p> <p>“Conversely” was wrongly used in most sentences it appeared.</p> <p>“Thanks to additional respiratory organs enabling---” could be put as “owing to additional respiratory organs enabling---”.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the English quality is not suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Refer to the manuscript.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Akaniro Ifunanya Rejoice</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Hong Kong Baptist University, China</p>