

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_101332
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Feeding Rates on Growth Performance and Survival Rate of Tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> L. 1758) Fingerlings Reared in Rectangular Hapas
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>)

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 additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Partial</p> <p>Partial</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English translation needs to be revised. I recommend that authors consult a certified translator or a native English speaker.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The topic of the article is a good one. Unfortunately, however, there are some issues that need to be fixed. The chemical composition of the feed and its structure are NOT presented. Feed is one of the most important components of an animal nutrition study, including fish. Also, for batch T1 (which is not fed), it is important to say what the fish in this batch consume, what are the natural food resources available to them. There are discrepancies between some values presented in the abstract and in the text, values that refer to fish sizes and water parameters. These must be corrected. Last but not least, the economic side of the study should also be addressed. It is true that the fish in the T3 group grew the best, but they had a lot of food available compared to the T2 group. If a digestibility study is done, it is that the T2 batch is more efficient in terms of profit, even though they grew more slowly. There are very few bibliographic references in the introduction, which is why I think it should be improved. Further comments can be found in the proofreading of the manuscript.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniel Cocan
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania