

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_129832
Title of the Manuscript:	Development Of Bioprocess Technology For Parasite Control In Aquaculture Commodities
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is relevant to the content of review paper.	
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>The abstract of the article is clear and provides a good overview of the topic, but it can be improved to make it more comprehensive and focused. Following should have added in the abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Although abstract briefly mentions bioprocess technologies, it does not elaborate on specific applications such as the use of probiotics, vaccines, or enzyme inhibitors. Including these would make the abstract more detailed and informative. b. Addition of potential future developments or research gaps could make the abstract more forward-looking. c. It should have added challenges in adopting bioprocess technologies, such as cost, scalability, or knowledge gaps. d. The phrase "make fish stronger" is vague. Instead of it, the author can use more scientific phrase "enhance fish immune responses" or "improve fish resilience to infections". e. Replace the repetitive phrase "These approaches are expected to reduce dependence on synthetic chemicals, improve the sustainability of aquaculture, and minimize the risk of parasite resistance" with "By reducing reliance on synthetic chemicals and minimizing parasite resistance, these technologies enhance the sustainability of aquaculture". 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, covering key aspects of bioprocess technology and its applications for parasite control in aquaculture. However, a more detailed review would help ensure the scientific rigor and clarity of the content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The statement regarding "administration of protease inhibitors to inhibit the development of parasites, virulence, and pathogenesis" needs further elaboration to clarify the mechanisms involved. b. While the manuscript mentions the effectiveness of various bioprocess techniques, it could include more specific quantitative data or experimental results to substantiate claims. c. The table summarizing bioprocess applications is informative but could be expanded with additional details such as experimental outcomes or case studies. d. Some terms, such as "enzymes made by microorganisms," could be more specific (e.g., "specific enzymes such as proteases or lipases"). The phrase "natural predators are used for biological control" could include examples for better clarity. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references included in the article are relatively comprehensive, and many of them appear to be recent and relevant to the topic.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is fairly suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Anil Dahal
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	School of Agriculture (SOA), Far Western University, Nepal