

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_125724
Title of the Manuscript:	Culture suitability of Macrobrachium rude with carp polyculture in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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 is a very promising research work. This research will provide clear information about the polyculture system of <i>Macrobrachium rude</i> and its outcome to the fisherman. This will help the stakeholders to take the necessary steps for chingri farming with carp fish.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title can be " Assessing the Compatibility of <i>Macrobrachium rude</i> in Carp Polyculture Systems in Bangladesh."	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, need to follow instructions properly	
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.	This article needs some grammar correction. The author didn't clarify the stocking density for each treatment just provided the number. But overall the article is scientifically robust because it provides cost and benefits information of chingri polyculture with scientifically proven.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References should not be enough. Especially in the discussion section, the author should compare with more recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author needs revision according to the comments	
Optional/General comments	Objective of the study to be mentioned clearly.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Aslam Khan
Department, University & Country	University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh