

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_126194
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination Of Better Acclimatization Process For Channa Punctatus , A Fresh Water Air Breathing Teleost In Laboratory Condition
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a valuable study on the acclimatization process of <i>Channa punctatus</i> , a freshwater, air-breathing fish, under laboratory conditions. The importance of this research lies in its focus on survival and adaptability in varying environmental settings, which is crucial for both laboratory research applications and potential conservation efforts. The detailed observations on behavioral and physiological responses under different tank conditions offer significant insights into optimal laboratory conditions for this species. The findings contribute to the broader understanding of stress and environmental impact on aquatic species, making it a noteworthy addition to environmental and biological research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Determination Of Better Acclimatization Process For <i>Channa punctatus</i> , A Fresh Water Air Breathing Teleost In Laboratory Condition," is descriptive but could be refined for clarity and conciseness. A suggested alternative title could be: "Optimizing Acclimatization Conditions for <i>Channa punctatus</i> in Laboratory Environments" This alternative title is more concise and emphasizes the focus on optimizing acclimatization conditions, making it more appealing and straightforward for readers.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a general overview of the study but could be improved for clarity and completeness. Here are some suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Add Specific Objectives and Context: Begin by clearly stating the research objective, emphasizing the need for optimized acclimatization methods for <i>Channa punctatus</i> in laboratory conditions. Providing a brief context on the importance of this species in research or environmental monitoring could add depth. Include Method Details: Briefly mention the four different tank conditions (e.g., glass, sand, sand-soil mix, mud) to give readers an idea of the experimental setup without going into excessive detail. Summarize Key Results: Present a concise summary of the main findings, focusing on survival rates, behavioral observations, and adaptability differences among the tanks. Highlight the Study's Relevance: Conclude with a sentence on the practical implications of these findings, such as how they could aid in laboratory research or environmental studies involving <i>Channa punctatus</i>. <p>Here is a revised abstract with these suggestions incorporated:</p> <p>Suggested Abstract: "This study investigates the acclimatization process for <i>Channa punctatus</i>, a freshwater air-breathing fish, in varying laboratory conditions. Using four different tank setups—glass bottom, sand, sand-soil mix, and mud—the study aimed to identify the optimal conditions for survival and adaptability. Observations included mortality rates, changes in pigmentation, and behavioral anomalies. Results indicate that tanks with mud bottoms provided the best environment for acclimatization, showing the highest survival rates and least stress indicators. These findings offer valuable insights for laboratory studies and conservation efforts involving <i>Channa punctatus</i> under controlled conditions."</p> <p>This revised abstract provides a clearer, more focused summary of the study.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure appears mostly appropriate, but there are areas where it could be enhanced for clarity and organization. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract is included but could be more concise and should highlight key findings, objectives, and implications as noted earlier.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction provides relevant background information but could benefit from clearer subsections to discuss the significance of <i>Channa punctatus</i> and the study's objectives.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: This section is comprehensive, detailing tank conditions, fish sourcing, and experimental protocols. However, consider using subheadings for "Tank Conditions," "Fish Collection," and "Data Collection" to improve readability.</p> <p>Results and Observations: The results are presented clearly but could be better organized into specific subsections for "Mortality Observations" and "Behavioral Responses" for easier navigation.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion is well-rounded and interprets the findings effectively, though adding subsections could improve focus on specific points, like "Behavioral Anomalies" and "Implications for Laboratory Acclimatization."</p> <p>Conclusion: This section is clear and concise, effectively summarizing the study's findings and practical implications.</p> <p>Overall, with minor adjustments to subsections in the Methods and Results sections, the manuscript would have a more streamlined structure and improve readability.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust due to its systematic approach to studying the acclimatization of <i>Channa punctatus</i> in different laboratory environments. The authors used a controlled experimental setup, applying consistent conditions across multiple tanks, allowing for a clear comparison of mortality and behavioral responses among different substrate types. The observations, such as pigmentation changes and opercular activity, are relevant indicators of fish stress and acclimatization, supporting the study's validity. Furthermore, the inclusion of specific behavioral and physiological metrics enhances the reliability of the conclusions, making the manuscript a technically sound contribution to the field of fish biology and environmental adaptation research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript cover a range of foundational and relevant studies on <i>Channa punctatus</i> and fish acclimatization. However, many references appear to be older, with only a few recent studies cited. Including more current literature, particularly from the last five to ten years, would enhance the manuscript's relevance and show awareness of recent advances.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally understandable but could benefit from refinement to enhance clarity and professionalism for scholarly communication. Some sentences are lengthy or contain minor grammatical errors, which may affect readability. Additionally, scientific terms and expressions could be more precise in places. A thorough proofreading and slight rephrasing of certain sections, especially in the abstract and introduction, would improve the manuscript's fluency and make it more suitable for academic publication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>Muhammad Samee Mubarik</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Southwest University Chongqing, China</p>