

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_96495
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth Performance of Mahseer Fingerlings (Tor soro) Fed with Addition of Potassium Diformate
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, it expanded knowledge about this chemical indifferent aquatic animal species. Now using organic acid is in focusing to reduce using drug for disease prevention</p> <p>I changed the new title, please see in manuscript</p> <p>It looked to be not comprehensive because some words are no need to put and the conclusion is inappropriate according to results</p> <p>Structure also seemed to be inappropriate because the details given showed unclear explanation made readers confused</p> <p>Some data seemed to be wrong data for example FCR came from wrong calculation</p> <p>References are ok but authors should put them clearly in each sentence explained in paper</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There were some Bahasa words in this paper needed changing to English, writing style seemed to be wrong because some words were present passive voices in stead of passive voice that is international standard	
Optional/General comments	This paper can be improved with the comments of reviewers then submit back to the journal, but now it seems to be inappropriate	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pichet Plaipetch
Department, University & Country	Thailand