

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4588
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Dietary Duckweed (<i>Lemna minor</i>) on Growth performance of Grass Carp (<i>Ctenopharyngodon idella</i>) fingerlings
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study highlights the potential of duckweed (<i>Lemna minor</i>) as a sustainable and cost-effective feed supplement for enhancing the growth performance of grass carp (<i>Ctenopharyngodonidella</i>) fingerlings. By demonstrating that a 10% inclusion of duckweed in the diet significantly improves weight gain, specific growth rate, and feed conversion ratio, the research offers a practical solution for optimizing aquaculture productivity. The findings contribute to reducing reliance on conventional feed sources, promoting eco-friendly aquaculture practices, and supporting the nutritional needs of herbivorous fish species.	

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.	<p>1. "An attempted has been made to assess the impact of duckweed (<i>L. minor</i>) on growth parameters of grass carp (<i>Ctenopharyngodonidella</i>)."</p> <p>Correction: "An attempt was made to assess the impact of duckweed (<i>L. minor</i>) on the growth parameters of grass carp (<i>Ctenopharyngodonidella</i>)."</p> <p>2. "Significantly the improved feed conversion ratio also T2and T3 showed similar trend."</p> <p>Correction: "Significantly, the improved feed conversion ratio was also observed in T2 and T3, which showed a similar trend."</p>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound in terms of its experimental design, methodology, and interpretation of results. However, there are a few areas where clarity, precision, or scientific rigor could be improved. Below, I provide an assessment of the scientific correctness of the manuscript and highlight areas that may need attention.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally relevant and support the study's context, methodology, and findings. However, there are areas where the references could be improved in terms of recency, diversity, and coverage of key topics.	

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is mostly clear, but there are some grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistencies that need correction.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured with clear sections (Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, and References).</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript uses "MMT" (million metric tons) without defining it. This could confuse readers unfamiliar with the term. 2. "World fisheries and aquaculture production around 223.2 MMT, with aquatic animal production 185.4 MMT with India fish production is 17.55 MMT in 2024 according to Anonymous, 2024." <p>Correction: "World fisheries and aquaculture production is around 223.2 million metric tons (MMT), with aquatic animal production accounting for 185.4 MMT. India's fish production is 17.55 MMT in 2024, according to Anonymous (2024)."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. "Duckweed has been stated to have decentequilibrium of amino acids comparable to milk (Leng et al, 1995)." <p>Correction: "Duckweed has been reported to have a balanced profile of amino acids, comparable to that of milk (Leng et al., 1995)."</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "The experimental diet was prepared by adding different levels of duckweed in the basal diet." <p>Correction: "The experimental diet was prepared by</p>	

	<p>incorporating different levels of duckweed into the basal diet."</p> <p>2. "The water quality parameters of experiment (i.e. temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen and alkalinity,) werechecked on the first day of experiment and subsequently after every 15 days."</p> <p>Correction: "The water quality parameters of the experiment (i.e., temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, and alkalinity) were checked on the first day and subsequently every 15 days."</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:</p> <p>1. "Fish fed the pelleted diet containing 10 percent (T2) duckweed had the maximum weight gain and did not vary from fish in the different treatments ($P>0.05$) except for the group fed 20 percent duckweed (L. minor), with respect to weight gain and specific growth rate (SGR)."</p> <p>Correction: "Fish fed the pelleted diet containing 10% duckweed (T2) showed the highest weight gain, which did not significantly differ from other treatments ($P>0.05$), except for the group fed 20% duckweed (L. minor), in terms of weight gain and specific growth rate (SGR)."</p> <p>2. "Live weight gain of fish fed the control diet decreased more dramatically than that of the fish fed diets containing different amount of duckweed (L. minor) (Figure 1)."</p> <p>Correction: "The live weight gain of fish fed the control diet decreased more significantly compared to those fed diets containing varying amounts of duckweed (L. minor) (Figure 1)."</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>1. "This study suggested that 10 percent (T2) duckweed (L. minor) is beneficial for fish growth and management."</p> <p>Correction: "This study suggests that a 10% inclusion of duckweed (L. minor) in the diet (T2) is beneficial for the growth and management of grass carp."</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:	Ishfaq Mohiuddin
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India