

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129095
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of stocking density of Labeo rohita (Rohu) for the production of stunted yearling in cage culture conditions
Type of the Article	Research 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Yes, the manuscript titled "Effect of stocking density of <i>Labeo rohita</i> (Rohu) for the production of stunted yearling in cage culture conditions" holds significant importance. This manuscript is a significant contribution to the field of aquaculture, providing essential data and insights that can help improve fish farming practices, address industry challenges, and support future research initiatives.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is 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.	Yes, the abstract of article is comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript titled "Effect of stocking density of <i>Labeo rohita</i> (Rohu) for the production of stunted yearling in cage culture conditions" appears to be scientifically correct based on the provided contexts. Some key points are water quality parameter, growth, survival rate and statistical analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient and recent. Arrange references in alphabetical order.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the quality of language is suitable and scientifically appear for scholarly communication	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Remove numbers from citation. Write only author's name with year. Write scientific name properly. Is feeding rate 0.5% or 3-5% of BW. Do the literature review and mention the correct feeding rate. In Tables, mention full form of abbreviation below the table. In table 1, Year-1, it should be L1 and L2 instead of L1 and L.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indulata Tekam
Department, University & Country	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agriculture University, India