

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_119519
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Goldfish (<i>Carassius auratus</i>) Breeding and Larval Nurturing for Materialistic Aquaculture
Type of the Article	

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

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The research work is good and can improve the knowledge of rearing and breeding of Goldfish larvae (<i>Carassius auratus</i>) as an ornamental freshwater fish with economic importance. However, the structure of the manuscript is poor and lacks useful information.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes to some extent!</p> <p>4. No. If it is an "original research article", the introduction is completely weak and not comprehensive. Authors should improve the introduction with the most recent published articles and relevant research work. Moreover, I am not satisfied with the results and the discussion section which is not well organized. I suggest the authors to get ideas from the latest relevant articles published in the Journal of Advances in Research etc. and improve the structure of their manuscript.</p> <p>5. After the amendments, yes!</p> <p>6. Not enough references and I don't see any references in the text which is a major problem for the manuscript!</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Check English grammar!</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:	Seyed Ehsan Vesal
Department, University & Country	Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn, Italy