

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122186
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Viability and Operational Efficiency: A Comparative Study of Biofloc and Traditional Aquaculture
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
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.	Biofloc and traditional aquaculture are crucial for sustainable fish farming. Biofloc technology enhances water quality and reduces feed costs by utilizing microbial communities, while traditional aquaculture provides a well-established method for large-scale fish production. Understanding both methods is essential for improving aquaculture efficiency, environmental impact, and food security.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	More or less correct but the mention of the area where the study is performed should be highlighted with the title. "Economic Viability and Operational Efficiency: A Comparative Study of Biofloc and Traditional Aquaculture with special reference to Bangaluru, India" That might be the more appropriate title in this case.	
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.	In abstract section addition of 5 to 6 keywords is necessary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In introduction section some more light might be given towards economic standpoint regarding this technology with proper recent inside text citation which is missing to some extent. Authors have to add this.	
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.	Yes that manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because, It has several equations along with tabular expression as well. If, Possible Kindly add some graphical representation of the tabular data i.e. in Bar diagram or pie chart etc whatever is suitable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	This section is nicely prepared.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Recommended.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mainak Banerjee
Department, University & Country	RKDF University, India