

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.	The demand for mud crabs in the Asian market is immense, highlighting the importance of thoroughly analyzing and reviewing the diverse mud crab farming practices in India. However, the current review lacks a comprehensive exploration of all farming methods practiced across the country, as well as an evaluation of the pros and cons of different systems and their efficiency in addressing key issues in the sector. Moreover, the absence of a clear and logical flow in the writing diminishes the readability and coherence of the manuscript	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, Its suitable.	
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 title implies that the review offers an overview of mud crab farming practices in India. However, the abstract appears to focus more on the biology and ecology of mud crabs, creating a mismatch between the title and the content presented	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript's framework requires better alignment, with sections structured around the key stages of mud crab cultivation— hatchery, nursery, and grow-out—followed by focused discussions on specific products production like crab fattening, soft-shell crab production, and berried crab production. Additionally, a more in-depth review is needed on critical aspects such as feed types, stocking densities, pond preparation, economics, and livelihood improvement. Moreover, the most critical aspect—the role of Recirculating Aquaculture Systems (RAS), which has the potential to address many of the existing challenges in the mud crab industry—is entirely missing from the review While the article provides some insights into current mud crab farming practices, the information presented is not comprehensive enough to meet the standards for publication as a review article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	While literature on mud crab farming practices in India is limited, the manuscript could benefit from the inclusion of additional references, particularly in areas such as experiments or case studies on stocking densities, shelter design, economics, molting, nutrition, and aquaculture systems like polyculture and integrated culture, which are crucial for enhancing the success of mud crab farming.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Can be improved.	
Optional/General comments	The review does not adequately address the critical challenges currently faced by the mud crab industry, particularly the high mortality rates and associated disease outbreaks. Instead, it primarily includes generalized and well-known basic information about existing practices, which do not add significant value to the intended scope of the review. A more focused approach is needed, highlighting the specific practices followed in different states, the species cultured based on locality, the performance of hatchery-produced crabs, and the impacts of aquasilviculture and polyculture systems on mud crab farming. Additionally, there should be a detailed discussion on sustainable wet feeds for mud crabs. The explanation provided for crab fattening is not entirely accurate; crabs of any size, not just juveniles, can be fattened. The marketing section, which lacks substantial information, could be replaced with an analysis of the economics of different mud crab farming practices. Furthermore, the section on nursery culture would benefit from a more comprehensive review. Lastly, the review would be greatly enhanced by focusing on region-wise farming practices for mud crabs to provide a clearer and more practical perspective.	

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:	Naveen Nivas S
Department, University & Country	Kerala University of Fisheries and Ocean Studies, India