



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_49642
Title of the Manuscript:	High temperature effect on the growth performance of hybrid tilapia Oreochromis niloticus X Oreochromis aureus juveniles reared in a recycling system
Type of the Article	

**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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	This is a good scientific manuscript. However, the abstract needs to be more informative and to the point. There is a need to update the introduction, more details about the methods, the results should be clearer and to the point and the discussion must compare the results obtained with most recent and relevant work published recently	We change the title as suggested and also reduced the abstract to 250 word (the lower value possible) so now it goes to the point and in this version is shorter. We added a clarification in M & M section as requested by the first reviewer All references related with the growth of tilapia hybrids of juveniles and temperature are cited and discussed in the manuscript, this was recently reviewed. Also, we check in "Web of science" the recent studies on growth for tilapia hybrid and found 70 references, nevertheless not all of them are related with temperature experiments but all related with this research were mentioned and reviewed. We again review the manuscript and in our opinion methods and results are clear and concise. If the referee were more specific in her/his comments we could modified what she/he wanted.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Please adhere to the journal guidelines.	We check and follow the "General Guideline for Authors" of the journal.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)	The health of the juveniles was of our first consideration at any moment.