

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_102412
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of amphipods ( <i>Grandierella megnae</i> ) density on the growth and survival rate of mangrove crab ( <i>Scylla tranquebarica</i> )
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><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, it is true that this manuscript is important for the scientific community because it can provide information for the sustainability of crab farming by utilizing amphipods which are economically lower in price than artemia salina</li> <li>Yes, the title is appropriate</li> <li>Yes, the abstract of article is comprehensive, but there are some suggestions for improvement</li> <li>Yes, subsection and the structure of the structure of the script is appropriate</li> <li>I think this manuscript scientifically correct</li> <li>Yes, sufficient and up to date</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Yes, the quality of the language of the article is suitable for scientific communication	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the author needs to consider improving the suggestions given</li> <li>need to add pictures of types of crabs and amphipods</li> </ol>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ida Lapadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Papua University, Indonesia</b>