

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_124095
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative study on growth rates and length-weight relationships of Snow Trout (Schizothorax sp.) from Rasuwa, Nuwakot, and Okhaldhunga districts of Nepal
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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 work is crucial for the scientific community because it fills a large gap in our knowledge of the growth dynamics and health of snow trout (Schizothorax spp.) in Nepal, a species critical to both biodiversity and local economics. By comparing growth rates and length-weight connections across geographical locations, the study sheds light on how environmental factors influence fish performance in aquaculture settings. Furthermore, the findings emphasise the importance of specialised approaches to optimise fish growth under controlled settings, which may have broader implications for similar species in comparable situations.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it clearly conveys the main focus of the research. It can also be entitled, "Regional Variations in Growth and Health Metrics of Snow Trout (Schizothorax spp.) in Nepal: A Comparative Study".</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>In Place and Duration of Study section add year in the date (e.g August 18 to November 24, 2023.) Briefly mention the type of feeding trial conducted and the specific parameters measured, as this would give readers a clear understanding of the experimental design. For statistical Analysis, a note on the statistical methods used to analyze the data would enhance transparency regarding how the results were interpreted.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, they are appropriate.</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 demonstrates scientific robustness through its clear and systematic methodology, which includes a well-defined experimental design for assessing the growth rates and length-weight relationships of snow trout. The use of controlled raceway tanks and standardized feeding protocols allows for reliable comparisons among the different populations from Rasuwa, Nuwakot, and Okhaldhunga. Additionally, the statistical analyses employed to evaluate the significance of the findings contribute to the technical soundness of the study. The careful consideration of water quality parameters further enhances the validity of the results, ensuring that environmental conditions are accounted for in assessing fish health and growth. Overall, the manuscript is methodologically rigorous and contributes valuable insights to the field of aquaculture and fisheries science.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>For a strong discussion and reasoning, add some more references and discuss the related work and results from previous studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Minor corrections must be made.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Zarka Yousuf
Department, University & Country	SKUAST-K, India