Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJFAR_119883**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CULTURING OF DUCKWEED (Lemna minor) UNDER DIFFERENT CHICKEN MANURE CONCENTRATION IN THE LAB**
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)**	1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the use of duckweed (Lemna minor) in phytoremediation, specifically in the context of varying chicken manure concentrations. 2. The current title is suitable, but it can be made more concise and specific: Original Title: Research on the Culturing of Duckweed (Lemna minor) Plants under Different Chicken Manure Concentrations in the Laboratory Suggested Title: Culturing Duckweed (Lemna minor) with Varying Chicken Manure Concentrations for Phytoremediation 3. No. A comprehensive abstract should be added to summarize the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions of the study. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate 5. The manuscript appears scientifically correct, but it requires minor revisions for clarity and detail. 6. The references are adequate but could be updated to include more recent studies to strengthen the context and relevance of the research.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language/English quality of the article needs some improvement to be suitable for scholarly communication. For example, the sentence "The experimental design was based on an assumption that duckweed spores are contained in the bottom of flood plain stagnant pools" could be rephrased for clarity: "The experimental design assumed that duckweed spores are present at the bottom of floodplain stagnant pools." Simplify complex sentences and remove redundant phrases. For example, "The sprouting of duckweed (Lemna minor) was monitored under media chicken manure concentrations of 5g per 10lit. for treatment one. Treatment two was 7.5g per 10lit of water..." can be rephrased for brevity: "Duckweed sprouting was monitored under chicken manure concentrations of 5g, 7.5g, 10g, 12.5g, and 15g per 10 liters of water."	
Optional/General comments	**Significance and Contribution:** The research provides valuable insights into the cultivation of duckweed (Lemna minor) using different concentrations of chicken manure, highlighting its potential in phytoremediation and sustainable agriculture. This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on using natural methods for water treatment and biomass production. **Title and Abstract**: The title is appropriate but can be made more concise and specific. Including an abstract is crucial as it provides a summary of the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. A well-written abstract will enhance the manuscript's accessibility and impact. **Introduction**:	

	The introduction provides a good background but can be improved by including more recent references and clearly stating the research hypothesis or questions. This will help in setting a clear direction for the study. **Methodology:** The methodology is detailed but could benefit from a more concise and structured presentation. Grouping similar steps and clarifying the replication process will improve readability and reproducibility. **Results:** The results section is well-documented but needs to highlight significant findings more explicitly. Use tables and figures effectively, ensuring they are properly labeled and referenced in the text. **Discussion:** The discussion should compare the study's findings with existing literature to contextualize the results. Address any anomalies or unexpected results and discuss their implications for practical applications and future research. **Conclusion and Recommendations**: The conclusion should succinctly summarize the main findings and their significance. Recommendations should be specific and based on the study's findings, suggesting potential areas for further research. **Language and Clarity:** The manuscript requires improvements in language and clarity to be suitable for scholarly communication. Focus on correcting grammatical errors, ensuring consistency, and adopting a formal tone. Simplify complex sentences and remove redundant phrases. **Overall Structure:** The overall structure of the manuscript is appropriate, but the flow of information can be improved. Ensure smooth transitions between sections and logical grouping of related information. The manuscript contains valuable research but requires significant improvements in language clarity, structure, and the addition of ethical considerations and competing interest statements. Addressing these points will enhance the manuscript's quality and readability, making it more suitable for publication.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**S. Meenachi**
Department, University & Country	**K. S. Rangasamy College of Technology, India**