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	

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

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	**The authors have clearly stated the objectives and this is good information for researchers to know more about potential of Amur carp in sodic soil conditioned pond.** **However, the manuscript suffers from the following:** Abstract and material & methods Since stocking density may be described as kg/m3 (or g/m3) or fish/m3, the authors should add & “fish”, when they indicate the stocking densities evaluated (100 fish/cage, 200 fish/cage, and 300 fish/ cage). Statistical methods The ANOVA must be used to compare treatment groups. To decide on the best stocking density in the treatmens, authors must use regression models. The results seem to indicate a quadratic relation between predictor (stocking densities) and the response (growth performance variables). Therefore, regression models are suitable, because they will indicate maximum or minimum values (that is, the stocking densities that will optimize the growth performance variables). The best stocking density may not necessarily be 100 fish/cage but other values within the range of values tested (100 to 300 fish/m3). Regression analysis allows you to identify the maximum or minimum point of each variable, estimating the exact point of stocking density for optimization. Therefore, the regression analysis must be included in the study. SE is most appropriate to than SD, and use one unit Conclusion Convey the correct conclusion and along with economics	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Manjulesh Pai**
Department, University & Country	**ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Education, India**