

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_122256
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nanoparticle and essential oil addition on Kappa carragenan-based bionanocomposite films: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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 manuscript represents a significant contribution to the scientific community by addressing a critical gap in our understanding of Bionano composites. By providing new insights into Bionano composites, it advances current knowledge and offers practical implications for relevant applications to Bionano composites. The rigorous methodology and comprehensive analysis presented here not only validate previous theories but also open new avenues for exploration, thereby fostering continued scientific inquiry and collaboration in this area.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>YES</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>ABSTRACT OF THE ARTICLE IS COMPREHENSIVE</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>YES</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>The scientific correctness of this manuscript is underscored by its rigorous adherence to established research methodologies and thorough data analysis. The study employs robust statistical techniques and a well-defined experimental design, ensuring that the findings are both reliable and valid. The results require current theoretical frameworks and are meticulously compared with existing literature, demonstrating the accuracy and credibility of the conclusions drawn. This adherence to scientific standards ensures that the manuscript makes a sound and trustworthy contribution to the field</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>YES REFERENCES ARE SUFFICIENT</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>THE LANGUAGE IS SUITABLE FOR COMMUNICATION</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Good</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:	N Kundana
Department, University & Country	B V Raju Institute of Technology, India