

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_114758
Title of the Manuscript:	Monoculture and Mixed culture of Pacific white shrimp <i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i> and Tiger shrimp <i>Penaeus monodon</i> in Biofloc system – A comparative study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>1.This manuscript is important to the scientific community. By means of the studies and research carried out in this article, the aim is to find solutions for solving the problems related to plastic pollution.</p> <p>2.The title " Monoculture and Mixed culture of Pacific white shrimp <i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i> and Tiger shrimp <i>Penaeus monodon</i> in Biofloc system – A comparative study" is correctly.</p> <p>3.The abstract is well structured and readable.</p> <p>4.The subsections and structure of the manuscript is adequate. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The sentences are short, simple and attractive.</p> <p>5.The content, methods, discussion, results, conclusions is in the field.</p> <p>6. In this article, the reference list includes 59 bibliographic titles. Among the cited articles, 42.3% were published relatively recently, i.e. after 2018 year.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of english language of this article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Radu Daniela
Department, University & Country	Fish Culture Research and Development Station, Romania