

Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4557
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient utilization, growth responses of Oreochromis niloticus juveniles fed varying dietary levels of water melon rind waste
Type of the Article	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 robust and technically sound. scientificall

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: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this</b>	Maybe I don't comment much. However, this research is quite good. Because it utilizes watermelon skin waste as feed for tilapia ( <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> ).	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is not clear. Maybe I suggest the title "Growth Response of Young <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> Fish with Watermelon Peel Waste Utilization Approach"	
<b>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.</b>	Please fix the abstract because I don't get clarity from the abstract because it is different from the content of the article. In the abstract, the method and conclusion are not listed, only the research results.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Less scientific, because there is no discussion of the results obtained. In addition, the method used is very unclear. The author does not provide a method for how much feeding rate is used. An explanation of the background of using watermelon skin waste. Then in the treatment, the use of WMP percentages of 25%, 50% and	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them</b>	Current references are still lacking. And the number of references is still very lacking. Please add references and they must be current references.	

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, it is	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Overall, this article is very lacking in terms of methods, background, discussion of research results and also the references used.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ade Kurniawan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Yapis Papua, Indonesia</b>