

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_101271
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS CONTENT EVALUATION OF FEED CONTAINING TERMITE AS A POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE FOR FISH FEED
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>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>Partially</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It is not worded properly</p> <p>Not in the case of methodology</p> <p>The subject is interesting, but there is no talk about the feasibility of producing or supplying end meal or worm</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The information presented in Table 1 is unnecessary. Table 2 can be removed and describe the information in the methodology. I suggest changing the wording of the methodology without using sections. Review the way it is done in other scientific articles.</p> <p>The experimental design is deficient: no controls were used, so the results and conclusions have no scientific basis.</p> <p>Poor statistical management</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Some observations in the annex document	

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:	D.C. Alfonso Benítez de la Torre
Department, University & Country	México