

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_129298
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Overview of Mud Crab (Scylla Sp.) Farming Practices in India
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is an important contribution to the scientific community as it specifically addresses mud crab aquaculture practices, which have significant implications for the fisheries domain (aquaculture). The findings add to the existing body of knowledge by providing a comprehensive overview. Furthermore, they are likely to stimulate further research and applications in related areas, thereby advancing the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title appears to be relevant to the manuscript's content, but it could be more specific to reflect the central theme or findings.	
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.	The abstract provides a good summary but could benefit from more concise language to immediately highlight the core findings and recommendations. Simplify the abstract to emphasize key findings and reduce redundancy in the introduction by summarizing background details.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound and free from significant errors. Some sections, particularly the introduction and discussion of marketing, are overly detailed and may distract from the primary focus on farming practices. There are inconsistencies in the use of species names (e.g., "S. serrata" vs. "Scylla serrata"). These inconsistencies could confuse readers unfamiliar with the subject. Standardize species naming throughout the text to improve readability. While the article summarizes practices and challenges, it lacks quantitative analysis or insights into how these challenges impact productivity or sustainability. Include data trends or statistical insights (if available) to strengthen the review's analytical depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and relevant. However, the reference formatting is inconsistent. Standardize the reference style according to a specific citation format.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Several points, such as the reliance on wild-caught seeds and the challenges in larval rearing, are repeated in multiple sections. Consolidate repetitive content to streamline the article. Minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing are present (e.g., "This species is highly sought after... which includes a variety of essential nutrients."). Revise for grammatical accuracy and readability.	
Optional/General comments	The article lacks figures, diagrams, or tables, which could enhance understanding of complex processes	

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:	John Vincent I. Manalo
Department, University & Country	Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology, Philippines