

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_114848</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF FOUR HORMONAL PREPARATIONS IN THE ARTIFICIAL PROPAGATION OF <i>Heterotis niloticus</i> (Cuvier, 1829)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It discusses an important component of aquaculture production, notably the use of hormone preparations to propagate the African bony tongue fish (<i>Heterotis niloticus</i>). This specie is significant in aquaculture because of its potential for commercial production.</li> <li>2. Yes, it is suitable</li> <li>3. Yes</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure are appropriate. Subsections clearly organise the study process, findings, and implications.</li> <li>5. Yes, I think it is. The methodology and data given suggest that the manuscript is scientifically correct. The statistical analysis used to compare the outcomes provides a more robust investigation.</li> <li>6. References are not sufficient; it should be updated to more recent works. Highest reference seen is 2020</li> <li>7. The manuscript discusses statistical analysis; it would be beneficial to offer more information regarding the statistical procedures employed, such as the specific tests performed and the significance level used. This would increase the transparency and reproducibility of the findings.</li> <li>8. It is essential to fully state any ethical approval obtained for the study, as well as any animal welfare concerns made throughout experimentation.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear appropriate for scholarly communication. The wording is generally clear and cohesive, making it understandable to the scientific community. However, there are some grammar flaws and strange phrasings that might be fixed for more clarity and professionalism. Overall, the language proficiency is adequate for scholarly communication but might be improved.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eseoghene Olaifa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Covenant University, Nigeria</b>