

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121913
Title of the Manuscript:	Synergistic effects of prebiotics and probiotics on the performance and physiology of juvenile Nile tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>)
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<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 significant to the scientific community and this topic is crucial for the aquaculture industry as it aims to improve nutritional efficiency, health, and growth of fish. The study's findings can contribute to reducing feed costs, enhancing fish immunity, and minimizing the use of antibiotics, which are pressing concerns in sustainable aquaculture. I appreciate the manuscript for its comprehensive experimental design and detailed methodology, including biochemical and histological analyses. The use of multivariate analysis to understand the complex interactions between different variables adds depth to the study. Additionally, the manuscript's clear presentation of results and logical conclusions makes it a valuable contribution to the field. The recommendation of the SIMB II dose (4 g/kg of probiotic + 4 g/kg of MOS) as an effective dietary supplement is particularly useful for practical applications in aquaculture.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Synergistic effects of prebiotics and probiotics on the performance and physiology of juvenile Nile tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>)" is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. If an alternative title is needed, a suggestion could be: "Enhancing Juvenile Nile Tilapia Growth and Health through Prebiotic and Probiotic Supplementation: A Comprehensive Study." This alternative title maintains the focus on the benefits of prebiotics and probiotics but emphasizes the comprehensive nature of the study and its implications for growth and health.</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 of the article is quite comprehensive, summarizing the objectives, methods, key findings, and implications of the study effectively. However, there is room for improvement to make it even more concise and impactful.</p> <p>This study investigates the synergistic effects of prebiotics and probiotics on the productivity and physiological parameters of juvenile Nile tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>). Conducted over 60 days at the Federal University of Grande Dourados, the experiment utilized a completely randomized design with 300 fish distributed across five treatments: Control, PROB (4 g.kg⁻¹), PREB MOS (4 g.kg⁻¹), SIMB I (2 g.kg⁻¹ probiotic + 2 g.kg⁻¹ prebiotic), and SIMB II (4 g.kg⁻¹ probiotic + 4 g.kg⁻¹ prebiotic). Key findings include improved feed conversion, protein efficiency rate, and protein retention in treatments with additives, with SIMB II showing the highest intestinal quotient and plasma glucose index. Histological evaluations of the midgut and enzymatic analysis of the liver and intestine showed no significant differences between treatments. Multivariate analysis revealed distinct physiological responses in fish receiving additives compared to the control group. Incorporating MOS additives and probiotics, particularly the SIMB II dose, significantly enhances growth and health in juvenile Nile tilapia, offering a promising approach for sustainable aquaculture.</p> <p>This revised abstract is more concise, emphasizes the key findings and implications, and provides a clearer recommendation based on the study's results.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate for a scientific paper, as it follows a logical flow from the introduction of the research problem to the presentation of results and conclusions.</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</p>	<p>Based on the information provided in the document, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The study was conducted using a well-defined experimental design, including a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) and the use of appropriate statistical analysis methods. The proximate composition of feed ingredients and the physico-chemical</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>parameters of water were analyzed using standard methods, ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the data. The findings and results are presented in a clear and detailed manner, providing insights into the impact of Synergistic effects of prebiotics and probiotics on the performance and physiology of juvenile Nile tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>).Therefore, based on the information available, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>The references provided in the document include a mix of recent and older sources. While some references are from the early 2000s and late 1990s, there are also more recent sources from the 2010s and 2020s. The inclusion of older references is understandable, as they may contain foundational knowledge and established theories in the field of aquaculture and fisheries. Overall, while the references provided offer a mix of historical and recent perspectives, it would be beneficial to supplement the list with more recent and relevant sources to strengthen the study's scholarly foundation and demonstrate an up-to-date understanding of the subject matter.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>To improve the language quality for scholarly communication, the manuscript should undergo a thorough editing process to correct grammatical errors, standardize terminology, format the text properly, eliminate redundancies, and ensure clarity and precision in the language used. This will help to convey the research findings effectively to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Delara Sepehrfar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Gorgan University of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Iran</p>