

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126667
Title of the Manuscript:	Commensal and pathogenic bacteria associated with farmed Rainbow Trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> Walbum) and aquaculture environment
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	The selection of trout as a research material, which is not a common fish consumed in India, is quite interesting. The results of this study will certainly be useful in the future when fish farming techniques in India or other regions are increasingly developed. It's just that the presentation in this paper is less interesting because the references are very old and the methods are not very clear.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think the title is appropriate	
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.	The abstract does not clearly describe the method and results. The number of samples used, the method of data analysis, the results obtained should be clear, about where common and pathogenic bacteria are found, how many and whether this is harmful to trout farming or consumers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It is better to separate the results and discussion	
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.	The findings of this study related to the type and number of bacteria are still relevant to the existing theory. Some of the references used as references are quite strong, but they should be replaced with the latest ones.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Similar research has been done a lot and it is quite easy to find references from the last 10 years to discuss this idea.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Should be improved	
Optional/General comments	The purpose of the research should be clearly visible in the abstract and introduction. The methods used are revised or clarified. References are updated. Results and discussion are separated. Conclusions can be made shorter to answer the purpose.	

Review Form 3

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:	Agustina
Department, University & Country	Mulawarman University, Indonesia