

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_106103
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the impact of probiotics on the gut ecosystem and morpho-histology in fish: current knowledge
Type of the Article	Review Article

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? The manuscript aims to compile information on the influence of probiotics on the ecosystem and morpho-histology of fish intestines, providing a comprehensive overview of the topic and predicting future perspectives in aquaculture (Page 3). Given the increasing importance of aquaculture and the role of microbiota in fish health, the manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community. Is the title of the article suitable? The title accurately reflects the manuscript's focus on the impact of probiotics on the gut ecosystem and morpho-histology in fish. It is both descriptive and comprehensive, making it suitable for the article. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract highlights key aspects such as the role of probiotics in promoting a balanced gut microbiota in fish, which in turn can lead to benefits like pathogen defense and improved digestion (Page 2). It appears to be comprehensive in summarizing the main points of the article. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The manuscript is structured into sections like Introduction, Methods, and Impact of Probiotics on Gut Microbiota, among others (Pages 3-4). This structure is appropriate for a review article and aids in the logical flow of information. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The manuscript gathers a total of 135 published articles as literature sources and discusses the complex and variable impact of probiotics on fish gut microbiota (Page 4). It appears to be scientifically correct, based on the methodology and the references cited. Are the references sufficient and recent? The manuscript cites a range of articles, including those published as recently as 2023 (Page 23). The references appear to be both sufficient and recent, covering various aspects of the topic. <p>Additional Suggestions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion on the limitations of current research and potential areas for future studies. It may also be useful to include case studies or real-world applications of probiotics in aquaculture to provide a more practical perspective. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>the language and English quality appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript employs technical terminology appropriately and maintains a formal tone throughout. For instance, phrases like "Positive regulation of gene expression," "Significant increase in intestinal microvillar density," and "Characterisation of Lactic Acid Bacteria" (Pages 7, 18, 20) indicate a high level of language proficiency suitable for an academic audience.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Cohesion: The manuscript is well-structured and follows a logical flow of information, making it easier for the reader to follow the arguments and understand the scientific context. However, the authors might consider adding transitional sentences between sections to improve the narrative flow. Figures and Tables: The manuscript includes tables that summarize key findings effectively (e.g., Table 1 on Pages 7-9). However, the inclusion of more figures to visually represent data or concepts could enhance the manuscript's impact. Methodological Rigor: The manuscript employs a systematic review methodology, citing a total of 135 published articles (Page 4). While this adds credibility, a more detailed explanation of the selection criteria for these articles could add rigor to the research. Practical Implications: The manuscript could be strengthened by discussing the practical implications of the findings. Given that the paper is focused on aquaculture, insights into how the research could be applied in real-world settings would be valuable. Limitations and Future Research: While the manuscript is comprehensive, it would benefit from a section discussing the limitations of the current state of research and suggesting avenues for future studies. Accessibility: The manuscript is written in a scholarly manner, which is appropriate for the intended audience. However, a summary section that distills the key findings into more accessible language could broaden the paper's reach. Ethical Considerations: Given that the manuscript deals with the use of probiotics in aquaculture, a brief discussion on ethical considerations related to animal welfare could be a valuable addition. <p>The manuscript is well-structured, scientifically sound, and contributes valuable information to the field of aquaculture and microbiology. However, it could benefit from minor revisions, particularly in adding sections on ethical considerations and competing interests, to align more closely with standard scholarly guidelines. Therefore, the manuscript falls into the "Minor Revision" category.</p>	
---	---	--

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Afranio Cogo Destefani</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>EMESCAM, Brazil</p>