

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_127258
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Lactobacillus sporogenes supplementation on growth performance, survival, immune parameters, and disease resistance in Labeo rohita exposed to Aeromonas hydrophila
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The authors aim to study the effect of probiotic bacterium <i>Lactobacillus sporogenes</i> supplementation on growth performance, survival, immune parameters, and disease resistance in <i>Labeo rohita</i> challenged with <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> and found that the probiotic supplementation effectively increased growth performance in <i>Labeo rohita</i> with effect of humoral immune response. The authors claim that the probiotic supplementation showed protection in rohu challenged with <i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i> .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Slight modification required: instead of exposed challenged may be written	
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.	Check the grammar	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	N. Ranjit Kumar
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, India