

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_105111
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth Performance in Transgenic Mutiara Catfish using Low Protein 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://journalajb2t.com/index.php/AJB2T/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the subject of the paper is important for and contributes to the scientific community. 2. The title is suitable for the paper. 3. Abstract is comprehensive but it has to follow the journal guideline. In this section what does RAL mean? It should be defined. It is not clear what normal growth means. Better to define the meaning of normal growth in the study. 4. The headings and subheadings are written in accordance with the guidelines for the journal. 5. The Manuscript is worthy of a primary publication that can add information regarding the feeding efficiency of catfish with low-protein feed despite it having a lower growth efficiency than protein-rich feed. However, in its current form, it is unpublishable and a lot of work needs to be reworked to make it happen. For example, in the result and discussion section, the p-value has to display either in the text or in table form. Other questions and detailed remarks are forwarded on original manuscripts in track changes. 6. In the manuscript, limited references are used, and of those almost 23% of the references are too old (< 2000). It would be best to compare the findings of the study to recent related investigations. Some references are incomplete and have to be thoroughly checked. In the list of references author(s) use a thesis but the type of thesis did not clearly mention. Journal articles if possible have to include <i>doi</i> number. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language needs to be improved, and the manuscript's presentation is weak. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language editing and evaluation by an English speaker or native will be essential during this process to increase readability and clarity. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wondie Zelalem Amanu
Department, University & Country	Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia