

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_130548
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of substitution of fish meal by cricket meal (<i>Acheta domesticus</i>) on the growth of fry of <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)
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>

Review Form 3

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.	The study addresses a pressing issue in aquaculture— identifying sustainable alternatives to fishmeal. This is essential given the environmental and economic challenges associated with fishmeal production.	
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.	YES	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	YES	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Recommendations for Improvement <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A 45-day trial is insufficient to assess long-term impacts on growth, reproduction, and health of the fry.2. Testing only two diets (100% fishmeal and 100% cricket meal) is a significant limitation. Including intermediate substitution levels would provide insights into optimal inclusion rates.3. Although the manuscript describes the study environment, it lacks details on water quality parameters (e.g., dissolved oxygen, ammonia levels), which could influence the results.4. Future studies should include diets with varying levels of cricket meal substitution (e.g., 25%, 50%, 75%) to identify the optimal inclusion level.5. Provide a detailed nutritional breakdown of the experimental diets, including amino acid profiles and digestibility coefficients.6. Conduct longer trials to evaluate the sustainability of cricket meal- based diets over the entire production cycle of tilapia.7. Include a cost-benefit analysis comparing the production and use of cricket meal versus fishmeal.8. Replicate the study under different environmental and rearing conditions to ensure the generalizability of the results.	

Review Form 3

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:	Erhan Unlu
Department, University & Country	Dicle University, Turkey