

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_126124
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of oregano, <i>Origanum vulgare</i> and <i>Natrum muriaticum</i> in tilapia, <i>Oreochromis mossambicus</i> (Peters, 1852)
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 study contributes to the ongoing trend of using natural compounds, like <i>Origanum vulgare</i> and <i>Natrum muriaticum</i> , as an alternative to synthetic chemicals in aquaculture. By showing their efficacy in boosting protein levels and haematological parameters in tilapia, the research promotes sustainable practices that align with global goals like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). The manuscript is valuable for the scientific community, especially for those working on sustainable aquaculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. No changes needed.	
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 is well-structured but could benefit from mentioning the broader implication of the study, such as its potential impact on the aquaculture industry beyond tilapia.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is logically structured with appropriate subsections. However, the flow between certain sections, like the results and discussion, could be smoother. Consider integrating the results more explicitly into the discussion for clarity.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting a comprehensive biochemical and haematological analysis. The use of <i>Origanum vulgare</i> and <i>Natrum muriaticum</i> is well-supported by previous studies. However, additional references in the results section would strengthen the analysis. For example, citing previous works that discuss the effect of these substances on other fish species could enhance the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally appropriate but could benefit from more recent studies in aquaculture or veterinary medicine. Consider adding studies that explore the use of natural remedies in broader aquaculture contexts to reinforce your argument.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and understandable but could be improved for scholarly communication. For example, some sentences in the introduction and results section are slightly long and can be simplified for better readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript addresses a timely and important issue in aquaculture, namely the reduction of synthetic chemicals. The methodology is sound, and the results are promising. However, the manuscript could benefit from a stronger conclusion that outlines specific future directions for research and potential industry applications.	

Review Form 3

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:	Obaidur Rahaman
Department, University & Country	Dhaka University of Science and Technology, Bangladesh