

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126474
Title of the Manuscript:	Anesthesia using eugenol for two weight classes of <i>Piaractusmesopotamicus</i> : Evaluation of induction time, recovery time, and behavioral response
Type of the Article	Manuscript-Article

Review Form 3

PART 1:ReviewComments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It ismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Similar titled articles were found during literature survey, but your work have a few element that differ from them- like monitoring of glucose level. Hence the title should be reworded signifying the unique aspects of your particular work.	Thankyou for your feedback. We have revised the title to highlight the aspect of yourobservation, specifically the monitoring of glucose levels, to betterdifferentiateitfromsimilarworks.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Rephrase using glucose level assessment aspect	Thankyou for your feedback. We have revised the title to emphasize the aspect of glucose levels.
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do yousuggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in thissection?Pleasewriteyour suggestions here.</b>	The weight classes (Class I included specimens ranging from 275 to 460 grams, class II included specimens ranging from 461 to 680 grams ) selected for study are too broad hence could not be considered. Preferred ranges as per your data could be- 250-300, 300-350,etc or 250-350, 350-450, etc.	Thankyou for yourvaluable observation in seeking to improve the manuscript. Aftercarefulconsideration, webelieveit’s best to maintain the currentorganization, as itensures an equalnumber of animals in eachtreatment and class. Categorizing in 50g intervalswould lead to uneven group sizes, potentiallyaffecting data consistency. Furthermore, these classifications alignwithBrazilian standards for fish in the grow-out and fattening stages.
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	1. The Results and discussions part contains well presented data.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	Good number of references are given, but a lack of recent references is noted. Since there are works pertaining to the similar area, more such works need to be referred.	Thankyou for yourvaluable observation aimed at improving the manuscript. Afterthoroughevaluation and additionalliteratureresearch, we have incorporatedseveral new references. Wenowbelieve the manuscriptincludessufficient citations to support the study.

Review Form 3

<div>Minor REVISION comments</div> <div>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarlycommunications?</div>	<div>Language is good.</div> <div>1. But discussion parts requires to be modified as follows- instead of “[29] describe that the gills of fish have .....” use “Honorato &amp; Nascimento [29] describe that the gills of fish have .....” . Similarly for all others.</div> <div>2. The weight classes (Class I included specimens ranging from 275 to 460 grams, class II included specimens ranging from 461 to 680 grams ) selected for study are too broad hence could not be considered. Preferred ranges as per your data could be- 250-300, 300-350,etc or 250-350, 350-450, etc.</div> <div>3. In the materials and method part, the time for which the fish was exposed to the anaesthetic in the tank isn’t mentioned. This is required to validate the results of table 1.</div>	<div>Thank you for your observation; we have addressed it in the manuscript. To provide a clearer response, we’ve organized our answers into the following points:</div> <div>1. The issue has been corrected in the manuscript text.</div> <div>2. As previously addressed in the abstract inquiry.</div> <div>3. In response to your question, the information is presented in Figure 2 (Results section).</div>
<div>Optional/Generalcomments</div>	<div>NA</div>	

PART 2:

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