



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_43189
Title of the Manuscript:	Sarputi, Puntius sarana sarana (Hamilton): a promising candidate species for introduction into the grow-out carp polyculture system of Tripura
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	<p>Introduction section, Lines 50 and 51 need references to support statements. Materials and Methods section, general comment: More detailed writing and consideration on providing the protocols used by previous science. If none, than state clearly the originality on the hypothesis.</p> <p>Conclusion Section, Line 107, the phrase “very little works” is incorrect. You need to rephrase it depending on the context. For the works in plural, then the “A few or few” works, if the work is general then the “works” must be used in singular form, thus “very little work”.</p> <p>Results section gets the strongest criticism. Without tables and Figures to support the text, the section is poor. Instead of the photos, the authors can attach the statistical analysis along with the errors. Since comparisons mentioned in the text (Lines 82-90), they could attach a figure showing this comparison.</p>	All the recommendations have been incorporated in the manuscript. Both tables and figures have been incorporated in the MS.
Minor REVISION comments	None.	
Optional/General comments	This paper is a very good idea for the future fish production and must be published. The worldwide aquaculture will need increased production in the future years, due to the climate change and the increasing population. New ideas with perspective are welcomed highly. Excluding the results section, which is the slighting of the paper, it is well written and documented.	