

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	

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>
<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>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the experiment conducted, title is not appropriate; it should be growth performance rather than length weight relationship. • The introduction does not sufficiently outline the background or significance of the study. It should better establish the context and relevance of the research question. The manuscript does not clearly articulate the research hypothesis or objectives. • The study design appears to have several methodological flaws. For example, the sampling strategy is not described in sufficient detail, which makes it difficult to assess the representativeness of the sample. Additionally, the data collection methods are not clearly outlined. Treatment information is not clear some where it is written five treatment (in abstract) and other place it was six (methodology). Authors created confusion in describing the treatment and replicates. The methods section is vague and lacks detail. Specific information on procedures, materials, and data analysis should be provided to allow for replication and assessment of the study's validity. • The results section lacks clarity in presenting findings. Tables and figures are not adequately explained, and the narrative does not effectively summarize the data. Improving the presentation of results will help readers understand the key findings. Water quality parameters including plankton analysis are not included which is very important aspects for correlating the growth under different treatments. • The discussion does not adequately interpret the findings in relation to existing literature. It should also address the limitations of the study and suggest areas for future research. • In general, the manuscript suffers from a lack of clarity and coherence. Many sections, including the introduction, methods, results and discussion, are poorly organized and difficult to follow. • There are numerous issues with language and grammar throughout the manuscript. For example, sentences are difficult to understand 	

Review Form 3

<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the Introduction and clearly state the research question or hypothesis and provide a more thorough background of the study area. • Improve the description of the study design, sampling, data collection, and statistical analysis. Ensure that appropriate methods are used and justified. • Revise the manuscript for clarity, coherence, and grammatical accuracy. • Conduct a more comprehensive review of relevant literature to provide context and support for the study. • Present results more clearly with well-explained tables and figures. Summarize key findings effectively. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>While the manuscript addresses an important topic, the issues related to study design and writing need to be thoroughly revised. I recommend substantial revisions before the manuscript is resubmitted for further consideration.</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>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>General Comments:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I appreciate the effort that has gone into this work. However, there are several significant issues regarding both the design and the writing that need to be addressed before this manuscript can be considered for publication. Below are detailed comments and suggestions:</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Monika Gupta
Department, University & Country	G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, India