

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_105397
Title of the Manuscript:	Strategy of Phytoplankton Administration in Larval Rearing to Improve the Survival Rate of Vannamei Shrimp Larvae of F1 and Free-Pathogen
Type of the Article	Short 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>The title of the manuscript is interesting,</p> <p>Strategy of Phytoplankton Administration in Larval Rearing to Improve the Survival Rate of <i>Penaeus Vannamei</i> Larvae of F1 and Free-Pathogen</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Very few references in this paper with many uncited assertions. the few references in this document are not too old</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I highlight a major revision of the scientific content of the article. An English specialist should be improved</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper requires a scientifically profound correction. With more statistical analysis to deserve a publication.</p> <p>Indeed this paper should take into consideration the measured parameters including notrate and nitrite over time.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sintondji Sèlomè Wilfried
Department, University & Country	University of d'Abomey, Benin