

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_119639
Title of the Manuscript:	Gonado Somatic Index in G5 Transgenic Mutiara Catfish At Different Temperatures
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Author tried to focus on transgenic vs non transgenic by using temperature. In normal fish also same results would have obtained because temperature doesn't have relation with transgenesis.</p> <p>It need modification as marked in MS</p> <p>No. Abstract not flagging whole work in nut shell.</p> <p>Yes, but some places it should be merged.</p> <p>Yes, sufficient but not much recent reference has been cited</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not suitable need proper sentence making and English quality should be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This MS need revision as rearing experiment many things are missing vz initial and final weight, feed used, water quality parameters, quality photographs of experiential setup etc after adding this paper will be more clear. Abstract, Introduction and M&M needs total modification. Conclusion is only two lines that too without future line of work/ recommendation.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. R. Thakur
Department, University & Country	ICAR-CIFRI, India