

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_101771
Title of the Manuscript:	DISTRIBUTION OF DISSOLVED ORGANIC MATTER FROM FERMENTATION CHICKEN WASTE TO CLIMBING PERCH ( Anabas testudineus Bloch) LARVAE VIABILITY
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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> Yes, the manuscript is written in a way that the reader can read and understand, in a simple way, and using the appropriate scientific language.</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> Yes. It matches the reality of the authors' writing and the topic addressed.</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> I suggest that the authors write a little above the objectives of the abstract, something that reports the reality of the topic, 3 to 4 lines, a brief introduction to report the topic addressed.</p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> Yes, they are suitable.</p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> Yes, authors need to review scientific writing, species names, whether they are in italics or not. A brief review.</p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> Yes, the references are up to date, but it requires minor adjustments, revision. In its formatting, following the rules of the journal.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Leandro Marques Correia</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centro De Ciências E Tecnologia, Universidade Federal Do Cariri, Brasil</b>