

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJFAR_125346 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of Black Soldier Fly (BSF) Larvae and Bloodworm Larvae Meals On The Growth Performance and Survival of Red Hybrid Tilapia, Oreochromis spp. During The Nursery Phase |
| Type of the Article | Short Research Article |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| 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. | This research is significant because it explores alternative protein sources for fish feed, addressing one of the key challenges in aquaculture—sourcing sustainable and affordable feed. BSF larvae are efficient at converting organic waste into high-quality protein, potentially reducing food waste and enhancing circular economy practices. Insect-based feeds may offer additional health benefits for fish, such as improved immune response, faster growth rates, or better disease resistance. These potential benefits could enhance the overall productivity and sustainability of aquaculture systems. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The current title do not meet an expectation and it's also more reader-friendly and directly addresses the study's core objectives. The better title can be "Evaluating Black Soldier Fly and Bloodworm Larvae Meals as Sustainable Protein Sources for Growth and Survival of Red Hybrid Tilapia (<i>Oreochromis</i> spp.) in the Nursery Phase" | |
| 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. | I will suggest rewriting the abstract again because the current abstract is a repetition that is already present in the manuscript as well as it is divided into subsections and is too long, please concise it into mainly important findings and critical results only. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes subsections and structure are appropriate | |
| 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. | The current manuscript may be scientifically correct only if some issues are addressed promptly and compulsorily included in the manuscript, such as – 1. BSF and Bloodworm meal preparation must be mentioned in 3-5 lines. 2. The discussion section should be rewritten to mention the reasons for observed results like why there is mortality in CP (just because of nutritional inadequateness) mention other reasons, as tilapia is a very hardy species, What is the reason there was an initial high weight gain in the commercial feed?, As you mentioned the BSF and BW showed high protein content but your results mention that the protein of CF is higher please explain, What is the reason that BSF has high survival rate and BW feed caused high weight gain, explain in detail with recent references. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The discussion should be rewritten and reasons should be mentioned to understand the results better, the references are to be added while writing the discussion. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English is understandable but manuscript need serious revision. | |
| Optional/General comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The authors must rewrite the whole discussion (especially 2nd and last para) which helps in critically understanding of results which are comparable with available literature worldwide.2. The results should be accompanied with the reasons3. There is need to study additional parameters for this study to come to an conclusion such as SGR,FCR,PER along with Amino acid profiling4. Mention the recent supporting studies as references in the discussion that totally use insect meals as the diets instead of partial replacement.5. Is the results given are significantly different than the control in survival percentage and weight gain <p>There is a need to seriously change the manuscript as there are very obvious results and parameters are studied that reduce the uniqueness of the research work. The manuscript can be accepted only if the mentioned changes are carried out and entirely depend on the editor's decision.</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) |
|---|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | RishikeshVenkatrao Kadam |
| Department, University & Country | Central Institute of Fisheries Education, India |