

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_76540
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of protein diet on growth and body composition of Labeorohita reared in glass tank
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Title to be corrected as suggested.2. Language to be corrected.3. The Abstract has to be corrected for language errors.4. The format of writing the Introduction to be corrected. <p>The Problem of the Study along with updated Literature Review and Aim of the Study to be given properly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. The Materials and Methods should follow the proper sequence. The period of study, proper reference to the methodology and details of the experiment to be properly highlighted. The physico-chemical (Water quality) parameters studied have not been highlighted properly. It should be expressed under a separate sub-head Analysis of Water Quality. The Sub-head "Analysis" is vague. Many aspects have been highlighted here Growth Performance and Biochemical Analysis. This has to be rewritten.6. In the Results, (a)Groups has been mentioned. There is no such mention in the Materials and Methods; it is expressed as T1,T2, and T3. (b) There is no evidence of the Water quality parameters studied (c) The biochemical analysis of muscle protein before and after the experiment should have been given to prove that the fish meal was responsible for the growth of the fish. (d) The Results of the initial length and weight of the fish should have been given in the Table to visualize the final increase in length and weight of the fish. Similarly, the protein content in the fish muscle before the experiment. (e) There is no mention of the Specific Growth Rate shown in the Table.7. The Discussion has been written very poorly. The matter should have been written under different sub-heads. There are no numerical data revealed to prove the significance of the study, only words have been used. There is a note on the Water quality parameters but no results of it have been revealed. Overall, the writing is not acceptable,8. References are not properly presented. The format of the Journal should be followed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Overall the language is very poor. This has made understanding of the contents of the manuscript difficult. The Author should have checked the language. Moreover, the Author has poor idea of designing a manuscript. Most of the portions have been haphazardly written. Proper format for writing the References has not been done. It seems, the work has not been completely presented. Further,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Title of the manuscript needs to be corrected as stated.2..Apart from language errors there are technical errors. These need to be rectified. The Conclusion is not specific.3. The Introduction has been very poorly written with numerous language faults .The problem of the study has not been expressed properly. The Literature Review is poor and the aim of the study is not clear. The References cited have not been written as per the proper format. The References include both the Harvard and Vancouver styles in the manuscript.4. The Materials and Methods has not been expressed properly. Apart from language errors there are numerous technical errors. Many vital information are lacking. It is not clear for what duration the experiment was carried. It is mentioned in the Introduction as 120 days whereas, in the methodology as 60 days. The References to the Methodology have not been given. The Sub-heading "Analysis" is vague.6. The Results seem to be incomplete. There is no data on the Water quality parameters and	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>the Biochemical analysis of Protein in the fish muscle before and after the experiment. The Legends to the Tables and Figures need to corrected. The Group should be converted to Treatments (T1,T2,T3). In the Table Specific Growth Rate has been shown. What was its purpose? There is no explanation of it in the Results.</p> <p>7. The Discussion is very vague.</p> <p>8. References are not written as per the format.</p> <p>A complete and thorough revision has to be made.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudip Barat
Department, University & Country	University Of North Bengal, India