

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_99962
Title of the Manuscript:	Maximizing the Potential of Stunted Fish Fingerlings through Innovative and Sustainable Aquaculture Practices for Enhanced Growth and Production.
Type of the 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the information provided in the manuscript will be useful to the fish breeders as stunted fingerlings could be a practical solution to address the problems of limited fingerling availability and high production costs in aquaculture. Multiple stockings and multiple harvesting are cost-effective methods to increase fish production and enhance pond productivity.</p> <p>Yes, it is self-explanatory.</p> <p>Yes. It is short and covers the Zeist of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is having sections and subsections at appropriate places.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, references are recent, but there should be one pattern while writing the references. Also, many references are very old , it should not be more than 10 year old.</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. There some punctuation and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>2. In the bibliography portion the text does not have uniformity and the paragraphs are not in justifying mode.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nancy Sheoran
Department, University & Country	Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, India