

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_123311
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth Performance of G6 Transgenic Mutiara Catfish At Different Stocking Density
Type of the Article	

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

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.	Stocking density experiment is important in commercial fish farming activities for high growth rates so this study is practically important for today's scenario	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ok	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Fig. 2 is missing in the manuscript	
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.	Farming in <i>budikdamber</i> may be common in few countries based on this the commercially important fish Mutiara catfish culture in different stocking densities is more relevant and the method followed is technically valid	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	comparisons are missing in the discussion part with other or similar findings	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. Mohan Raj
Department, University & Country	University of Madras, Sir Theagaraya College, India