

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_77215
Title of the Manuscript:	Benefits in Tilapia Growth, by Vetiver Grass in Aquaponics System, Improving The Water Quality and Obtaining an Aggregate Value
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Ypu should check your English writing, need to be fixed.</p> <p><b>Title</b> is not appropriate</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> the aim doesn't match with the result, this research focus in tilapia growth, water quality or Vetiver grass growth?</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> explain the background why you do this research, and support with little bit references. To get higher tilapia production or growth, or focus in Vetiver production, or water quality or.....</p> <p><b>Experimental design</b> is not appropriate, there are no treatment differnces such as stocking density of tilapia per mini-pond. P2, P3 and P4 are replicates or treatment, are not clear. Figure 3 and 4 are part of result, so put it in Result.</p> <p><b>Result:</b> Figure 5, 6, 7 are not displayed properly, there is no description in the image that makes it easy for the reader to understand. Table 1 also is not displayed properly, too small, and difficult to interpret</p> <p><b>Discussion and Conclusion:</b> you should answer of your research aim. Your discusiion is not focus, even you discuss what is not in your research aim</p> <p><b>References:</b> very less. Some from websites that should be supported by the research results from others.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>need to improve the way of writing, you can see from the writing style in international journals</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Angela Mariana Lusiastuti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indonesia</b>