

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_12533
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Impact Of Housefly Maggot Meal On Growth Of African Catfish (CLARIAS GARIEPINUS)
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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This study is highly relevant to the challenges faced by the aquaculture industry in developing countries, especially regarding feed costs.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of this article is appropriate</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive, not systematic, and does not have an experimental design, such as a discussion</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>This manuscript is not good due to the experimental design used is unclear, the number of samples is small, and the data is not processed properly. Treatment 3 with 2 replications so it does not meet the requirements for ANOVA analysis. The author is careless, there are 6 citations that are not in the references and 31 references that are not in the body of the text. There are 42 references, but only 10 are written in the body of the text (in green)</p>	

may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used are out of date, and the writing is inconsistent	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Mulyono Mulyono
Department, University & Country	Diponegoro University, Indonesia