

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFAR_122228</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Live Table Size Fish Transportation Practices in Nepal: Present Status and Its Prospective</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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>No solution for this survey towards the people there. Manuscript has scattered information which need to be improved. Is it a practice application for whole Nepal? Looks bias towards traditional way only no modern postharvest application at all in Nepal.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The tittle should add traditional/conventional/rural area to emphasize.</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>Revise the abstract. Too simple and straightforward with no significant value of study's conducted</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Certain part. Part after discussion is scattered</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>Is there any modern practice in fish postharvest? No solid reason why this study was conducted? Only survey without solution or educate to them? Any respond for this?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>References seem updated and sufficient. But discussion part should be more precise and clearer with additional information.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Ok. But I suggest proofreading and avoid silly mistakes like misspelling etc.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revise the abstract</li> </ul> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- recheck the environmental stressor for density.</li> <li>- ...dis-solved or dissolved?</li> <li>- sickness or disease outbreak?</li> <li>- Live fish marketing is now becoming popular due to preference of consumer in Nepal also. (Any reference from survey/government-Department of Fisheries?)</li> <li>- There are 1681 fish markets and 22,406 farmer's pond sites from which fish marketing are carried out and 69 live fish selling stall for the selling of live fish in Nepal. (From reference no. 11 or others?)</li> </ul> <p>Materials and method – Too simple</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table size – Average/range weight? Length?</li> <li>- How many respondents? Gender? Age phase?</li> <li>- Statistical analysis only using excel?</li> </ul> <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2022/023?</li> <li>- Total fish production in the fiscal year 2022/023 in Nepal was 113.73 metric ton, in which aquaculture contribution was 81.5 % and 18.5 % from capture fisheries Among the 77 districts of Nepal, 11districts was zero fish production. (REVISE)</li> <li>- Ten fish species ..... are also produced in the country. (REVISE AND REFERENCE)</li> <li>- Figure 2 each table size are not the same.</li> <li>- 3.2. – Is it from pond?</li> <li>- After fish harvest, the fish were kept in the plastic bag without water and taken weight by pouring in the dry bucket or in the aluminum hundies.(HANGING SENTENCE)</li> <li>- 3.3. Conditioning Practices – revise and add information</li> <li>- 3.6. Use of Sedative and Salt – It is better to compare both traditional and modern GAP practice. Bias results</li> </ul> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Physical stress, crowding – change terms like high density</li> <li>- Too straightforward</li> <li>- Why native people using traditional way? Mindset? Culture? Obligation of machine supply? Rural area? Discuss</li> </ul> <p>Prospective of live fish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fish is fresh and good quality when it is alive. Fresh live fish tastes better and is also healthier. [NO EXPERIMENT/ANALYSIS, HOW CAN YOU CONCLUDE THIS?] Or else put reference/survey attachment</li> <li>- In that context, good quality live fish for consumer with their certificates indicating the productions sites, harvesting and transporting methods will determine the fish price in the market. Therefore, live table size fish for consumers must be quality by following the scientific protocol by mitigating stress of handling and transportation. [VOGUE STATEMENT]</li> </ul> <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mortality as well as loss the quality of fish. [change to <b>possibly</b>]</li> </ul>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Azfar Bin Ismail</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia</b>