

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_107362
Title of the Manuscript:	BIO-ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF NOVEL FISH FEED FORMULATION SOFTWARE (FUTA AQUAFEEDAPP) FOR AFRICAN CATFISH Clarias gariepinus (Burchell 1822) RAISED IN RECIRCULATORY AQUACULTURE SYSTEM
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Thanks for a appreciation.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	Ok
Optional/General comments	I have carefully reviewed the paper titled "[BIO-ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF NOVEL FISH FEED FORMULATION SOFTWARE (FUTA AQUAFEEDAPP) FOR AFRICAN CATFISH <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> (Burchell 1822) RAISED IN RECIRCULATORY AQUACULTURE SYSTEM]". Overall, the paper presents an interesting study with several strengths. However, there are also areas that require attention and improvement before it can be considered for publication. Strengths: Original Contribution: The paper addresses an important issue and provides valuable insights. This contributes to the existing literature and opens avenues for further research. Methodological Rigor: The research methodology appears to be well-designed and executed. Clarity of Writing: The paper is generally well-written and organized. The introduction effectively sets the stage for the research, and the discussion section provides a coherent analysis of the findings. Areas for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none">I have highlighted some mistakes in the word file. Please rectify those. I believe addressing these points will significantly improve the paper's overall quality and readability.The discussion section could be expanded to provide deeper insights into the implications of the findings. How do the results relate to existing theories or practical applications in the field?	Noted

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The conclusion should be added, and it should summarize the key takeaways explicitly.Ensure that all references are properly formatted and cited according to the journal guidelines. <p>Overall Recommendation:</p> <p>This paper has the potential to make a significant contribution, but it requires some revisions and enhancements to meet the standards for publication. I recommend that the authors address the points raised in this review and submit a revised version for further consideration.</p>	
--	---	--

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>	