

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_126724
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Growth Performance and Economic Efficiency of Indian Major Carps in Integrated Fish-Duck Farming Systems
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This type of culture is an traditional practice which is to improve the net income by reducing the cost of production for integrated farmers. Indian major Carps are candidate species for culture in integrated farming system and they yield better growth and production which has been achieved in the study. Promoting the same in the rural area is an significant approach to enhance fish production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable	
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.	Kindly add bit of economic gain in brief.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	Since it is a standardised technology, the work implementation is according to the standard The production of two different organisms in a single space is will have the impact on the uptake and wide spreading of this standardised technology. The results are according to the scientific approach carried out.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References need to be updated with the recent ones	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Few corrections with the subtitles and scientific name depiction along with text justification is required	

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:	Chethan N
Department, University & Country	Fisheries Research and Information Centre, Bengaluru And Karnataka Veterinary, Animal and Fisheries Sciences University, India