

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_90657
Title of the Manuscript:	Water Quality Suitability of Padjadjaran Retention Basin for Aquaculture in Sustainable Floating Pond
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> )

### 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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Table 1 is not relevant and should be omitted. Table 2 should be set to allow parameters align with their outcomes. Experimental results Table 3 should be compared with relevant bodies as WHO, and national body standards for water quality. Table 2 and 3 should be merged together and included in the discussion.</p> <p>The methods were well captured and explanatory but the sentence should be rephrased. In 1, Average value of observation result per parameter was calculated for the entire station.</p> <p>In 4, the sustainability index (s) of each station was calculated using formula .....</p> <p>The conclusion is brief and needs to be expanded more.</p>	All correction done
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The parameters were well captured and explained</p> <p>The referencing were serial and current.</p>	All correction done

### 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)	