

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_122930
Title of the Manuscript:	Length – Weight Relationship of Rohu (Labeo rohita) advanced fingerlings under sodic soil condition
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>1. Yes it is important for scientific community</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. In manuscript description of Figure not mentioned in text example Fig. 9. There is no reference related with this example in reference section.</p> <p>5. In Fig. Number not mentioned text matter.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>2. Yes</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>No</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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>1. Final weight of Treatment groups T3 and T4 should be mentioned in text.</p> <p>2. In manuscript Caption not mentioned with Figures.</p> <p>3. Figure numbers not mentioned with figures.</p> <p>4. References (Jhingran, V.G., 1985; Gautam et al., 2024) not mentioned in text. Both references should be deleted from Reference section.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>1. References not listed alphabetically.</p> <p>2. References (Gupta et al., 2005; Steffens, 1989) not mentioned in Reference section.</p> <p>3. References (Bagenal et al 1978; Pradeepkiran et al., 2019 and Ujjania et al. 2012) should be corrected because in reference section these references not in the form of et. al. .</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Madhuri Sharma
Department, University & Country	NDVSU, India