

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Annual Research & Review in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARRB_121728 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluating Tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>) Survival and Growth in Aquaculture Systems with Different Feed Types |
| Type of the Article | Aquaculture & fish nutrition |

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. | The manuscript meets the sustainable developmental goals of aquaculture, regarding searching for alternative cheap formulated diets. Choosing the local available ingredients in Liberia to manufacture customized feed was a good a good choice, especially encouraging the DeSIRA-Integrated Rice-Fish Farming System (IRFFS) Project. As mentioned in the manuscript that aquaculture in Liberia is a novel practice, thence this article will be a starting point for the progress and welfare of the process that provides both a crucial human food source (fish) and national income improvement of Liberia. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| 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. | No The abstract needs more detailed info for the methodology, concerning rearing of fish, their stage, initial body weight, number per hapa net and feeding procedure and duration of the experiment. Additionally, the conclusion in the abstract needs clarification and illustration of the points by which the author achieved the objective of the study. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | No. Missing data are found whether in the abstract or the methodology or the results and discussion | |
| 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>Some points are scientifically missing in the manuscript that needs addition</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author didn't clearly indicate that you have successfully met your objective neither in the abstract nor the conclusion, though you have mentioned that Diet 1 produced best growth results!! 2. Kindly state the time-interval for measuring the water quality parameters of the pond. 3. The water quality parameters must be transferred to the results and discussion. In the methodology, you have to mention only the instruments used, with their model and the measuring time-intervals. 4. Beside any mean you have to state the SE. 5. The experimental trial did not commence with an acclimatization period for the fish. Moreover, the author did not mention the feeding method whether till satiation or fixed ration to the body weight! 6. The table of the nutrient composition illustrates the feed formulation only,, where is the proximate composition of the diets, including the moisture, ash, crude protein, crude lipid, NFE and gross energy?! 7. The discussion didn't include neither previous comparable nor contradictory studies, in addition to their interpretations. <p>If aforementioned corrections are made the manuscript will be robust, since it will cover the whole criteria dealing with low -cost, local alternative fish feed and its value and impact on culturing of the Nile tilapia in Libria</p> | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. : | The references are recent. Though, insufficient as the discussion needs more citations to illustrate previous studies. Moreover, the growth parameters equations need references. Kindly make the aforementioned corrections to demonstrate the value of the manuscript and to be scientifically in the correct form | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Marwa M. El-Naggar |
| Department, University & Country | Ain Shams University, Egypt |