

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_86317
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF ENCAPSULATED PROBIOTIC TO PERFORMANCE OF VANNAMEI SHRIMP ( <i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i> Boone, 1931)
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:

(<https://www.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In reviewer opinion, abstract is too short and needs to have more precise information related to the study.</li> <li>2. Reviewer strongly suggest to revise the concept of probiotic. For obtaining desired results, when using probiotics, it is necessary to use them in proper levels.</li> <li>3. M&amp; Ms are confusing and need more explanation regarding to the material used.</li> <li>4. It seems that results and M&amp; Ms are mixed. Please, separate them</li> <li>5. Do authors, submit their results to an ANOVA test? If so, did you find any statistical difference among them? Please, specify this in the table.</li> <li>6. Reviewer strongly recommends to rebuild the discussion. It is confusing and is not ordered according to obtained results.</li> <li>7. In the table of FCR, please specify if authors found any difference among experimental groups.</li> <li>8. In order to improve this work, reviewer recommends to conduct a polynomial regression analysis in order to access the best probiotic level required for each parameter.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keywords: Reviewer suggest that probiotic should be eliminated and include growth performance instead. Authors also can include the words: nutrient utilization, survival.</li> <li>2. INTRODUCTION: Shrimp commodity, may not be a proper term to refer to shrimp resource.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please, reduce to 2 digit (0.00) in all numbers used throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>2. Native speaker English proof is highly recommended.</li> <li>3. Please, standardized all the citations throughout the manuscript. Since some times authors are mentioning a number (e.g. [#]) and other times, authors are using the citation as it is, e.g. Smith et al., (2019).</li> <li>4. Please, standardized the name of each experimental group.</li> <li>5. Do authors believe that the use of probiotic consortium is a symbiotic effect? If so, you can discus your results based on this premise.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>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>Rodriguez-Estrada</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Juarez Autonomous University, Mexico</b>