

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
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	Case study

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recycling organic waste for fish farming serves a dual purpose: it helps manage waste disposal, thus benefiting the environment, and provides economic returnsThe effects of duck rearing on pond productivity, along with a cost-benefit analysis of integrated fish farming	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	Abstract correct	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Measuring the latitude and longitude values of the ponds and attaching the study area photos, which can reflect the reality of the work.Analyse the reason for the greater value of total alkalinity in INT.The statistical analysis part needs a clear explanation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Add recent reference minimum of 3 nos.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments	In the section 3.2 the word growth mentioned in two times. (Growth Growth performance of fish)	

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:	P.Meenakshi
Department, University & Country	Sri Chandrasekharendra Saraswathi Viswa Mahavidyalaya (SCSVMV), India