

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_121356
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECTS OF ADDITIONING TUNA MADIHANG BONE FISH TREATMENT ON THE GROWTH OF CATFISH (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>) IN BIOFLOC POND IN TERNATE CITY NORTH MALUKU, INDONESIA
Type of the Article	Original research article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript deals with the application of non- toxic, cost friendly organic substitutes in feeding of fishes under cultivation. On account of the increasing demand of catfishes for food and other commercial products, the idea of present research seems productive. Utilization of biofloc system also adds value to the research design. Overall, the manuscript has potential to contribute to scientific community as well as society.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	THE TITLE APPEARS VAGUE AND COMPLEX. SOME MODIFICATION CAN BE DONE. SUCH AS- “THE EFFECTS OF SUPPLEMENTATION WITH TUNA MADIHANG BONE FISH ON THE GROWTH OF CATFISH (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>) CULTURED IN BIOFLOC POND IN TERNATE CITY NORTH MALUKU, INDONESIA.”	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and as per the guidelines of the journal. Some sections mentioned in the guidelines, such as, acknowledgement, competing interests, author's contributions and ethical approval, are missing. Kindly include if these are applicable.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	With regard to the objectives undertaken for the present study, sufficient parameters have been studied. Formation of experimental groups is adequate. But, the manuscript is lacking statistical analysis of the data provided. Mathematical expressions or methods used for the estimation of experimental parameters should also be included. The captions of figures should be more explanatory.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent. But, the referencing style is not uniform; viz- reference no 2 and 7. It is suggested to style the references according to the guidelines of the journal. In- text referencing should also be done as per the guidelines. There is no uniformity in the referencing in- text.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/Generalcomments	The scientific name of the organisms should be in italics.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aman Kumar
Department, University & Country	Ranchi University, India