

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	

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>
<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>The work has serious deficiencies, since it does not include an analysis of the chemical composition of the diets, nor does it show the chemical composition of the ingredients, in order to make at least a theoretical calculation of the composition of the diet. Because of this, the results can hardly be repeated.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is not very suitable for this article.</p> <p>May be could be:</p> <p>Evaluation of tilapia (<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>) survival and growth with replacement of fishmeal by plant-based ingredients</p> <p>Or similar</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 seems clear, if space is required, the introductory information in the first lines could be reduced.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the end of the introduction, only the use of ingredients that are available is mentioned, but none of them are described. Could you please include more information? 2. In the experimental design part, could you please include the calculation of hydrated lime used for disinfection in kilograms per hectare? 3. In the experimental design section, could you mention what density corresponds to the number of organisms stocked in each hapa net (fish x cubic meter)? 4. In some water quality sections such as pH, electrical conductivity and total dissolved solids it is mentioned that the values are within acceptable ranges, but no reference value is cited. Could you please include some references? 5. In the statistical analysis you mention the weight gained in two different ways: growth and biomass production, although weight gained would be the most advisable, you should also call it the same way throughout the document. 	
<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 work has serious deficiencies, since it does not include an analysis of the chemical composition of the diets, nor does it show the chemical composition of the ingredients, in order to make at least a theoretical calculation of the composition of the diet.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Many of the references presented in the introduction are 8 or more years old, could you change them to more recent references?</p> <p>Especially the part about tilapia production statistics, some are more than 20 years old, could you review the most current statistics? I suggest you review the "State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture" presented by FAO every 2 years, currently at least the 2022 version is available.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is correct, however it would be advisable to have it edited by an expert.	
Optional/General comments	In the third paragraph of the Introduction some statistics from very old years are presented. For example, it is mentioned that the annual growth of tilapia production is around 12%, which might not be the case for the last period of 10 or more years. Also, the percentage, volume and value of tilapia production should be updated.	

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:	Miguel Arturo Cabanillas Gámez
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Baja California, México