

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_125157
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Feeding Different of Small Fish Feed on the Growth and Survival of Mangrove Crabs (<i>Scylla serrata</i>)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the relationship between doses of feed and the growth and survival of mangrove crabs (<i>Scylla serrata</i>), a species of significant ecological and economic value. Understanding the effects of different doses of feed can provide insights into optimizing aquaculture practices, leading to better resource utilization and sustainable crab farming. The study also contributes to filling gaps in knowledge regarding the nutritional requirements of <i>Scylla serrata</i>, which can enhance productivity in coastal aquaculture systems. I appreciate the manuscript for its practical application, but further improvements in experimental design and broader comparisons with alternative feeds could strengthen its impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is clear and informative, but it could be more concise and specific. An alternative title could be: "Impact of Different Small Fish Feeds on the Growth and Survival of Mangrove Crabs (<i>Scylla serrata</i>)"</p> <p>This version keeps the essential details while making the title more direct and focused.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the research, but it could be more focused and concise, with better emphasis on the key findings. Here are my suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Introduction and background: The abstract introduces the importance of mangrove crabs but should focus more on the research gap it addresses, like the lack of data on optimal feeding practices for fattening and survival.</p> <p>Results: The key findings are mentioned, but there is some redundancy. The conclusion repeats information already stated in the results. Instead, emphasize how the findings contribute to the overall research objectives.</p> <p>Suggested addition: Include a brief sentence highlighting the potential applications of the study in mangrove crab aquaculture or future research directions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear generally appropriate for a scientific paper.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-defined experimental design and use of replicates, which add reliability to the findings. The use of different feed doses and control of variables allows for a clear comparison of their effects on the growth and survival of mangrove crabs (<i>Scylla serrata</i>). The inclusion of statistical analysis strengthens the validity of the results by demonstrating the significance of the differences observed.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>Okay, the references are sufficient.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language in this manuscript needs improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	None.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vutthichai Oniam
Department, University & Country	Kasetsart University, Thailand