

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_113156
Title of the Manuscript:	FORMATION OF MALE SEX TILAPIA (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>) LARVAE BY IMMERSION METHOD IN NATURAL METHYLTESTOSTERONE HORMONE
Type of the Article	

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, because it brings a novel technology of breeding a male tilapia fish to supersedes other methods of culturing aquatic animals</p> <p>The title should be revised to: FORMATION OF MALE SEX TILAPIA LARVAE (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>) USING NATURAL METHYLTESTOSTERONE HORMONE</p> <p>The abstract must be revised and I have provided my suggestions and editing to the main manuscript</p> <p>The subsections are oky but with minor editing; the discussion section should contain three paragraphs.</p> <p>Yes, it is! However, the methodology should be strengthened as to what exactly happened during the study. Which and what and at what time exactly was it collected. Under the discussion section; You used immersion method; why? What was so special with this method? This method should have flagged out in the introduction section and well explained why opted for that over other available practised method. Again here; contextualise your data with other researchers who used similar method; what did they find and how does your findings deviate from those found by others who used different method. That discussion brings a balanced arguement</p> <p>The references are relevant and most recent. Here are some addition ones; Svobodová, Z., Lloyd, R.; Máchová, J. and Vykusová, B. (1993). <i>Water quality and fish health</i>. Rome. EIFAC Technical Paper. No. 54. Rome, FAO. 1993. 59 p.</p> <p>Sub-county, N., County, B., Makori, A. J., Abuom, P. O., Kapiyo, R., Anyona, D. N., & Dida, G. O. (2017). Effects of water physico-chemical parameters on tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>) growth in earthen ponds in Teso, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41240-017-0075-7</p> <p>Wurts, W. A., & Durborow, R. M. (1992). Interactions of pH , Carbon Dioxide , Alkalinity and Hardness in Fish Ponds, <i>O</i>(464), 1–4.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Just some minor typos that need to be corrected. When reporting, always use the past tense. The authors should proofread the entire paper to rectify some grammar errors</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Tijoy Lowore
Department, University & Country	Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resource, Malawi