

# Review of: "The Growth Performance of Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis Niloticus*) Fed Low-Cost Fish Feeds Formulated From Fish By-Products, Fishery By-Catch and Pig Blood-Meal"

Yalçın Tepe<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Giresun University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript presents "The Growth Performance of Nile Tilapia (*Oreochromis Niloticus*) Fed Low-Cost Fish Feeds Formulated From Fish By-Products, Fishery By-Catch and Pig Blood-Meal", which is noteworthy. Detailed review of the availability of locally available low-cost fishing by-products, fishery by-products and pig blood meal in place of expensive commercial feed.

Overall, the study is rich in data and well discussed. However, the manuscript, in its present form, contains several weaknesses. The language is not bad but best polished by native English speakers. However, the authors need to consider the following questions, some of which are clearly flawed and may be difficult to meet publication standards without addressing them well. Some inconsistencies and minor errors that needed attention are:

"Figure 1. Growth (weight gain) of *Oreochromis niloticus* raised in aquariums on different formulated diets for 11 weeks" is not enough to clearly show the result. Maybe it can be presented with a table to give a clearer idea.

I suggest you to write a highlights of the study by adding main quantitative findings to make it more understandable.

"Zimbabwe" should be included in keywords

The purpose of the study is not clearly stated. It should be stated at the end of the Introduction section.

In general, figures and tables are quite simple and carelessly prepared. Improvements are required for the tables and figs.

"Figure 1. Growth (weight gain) of *Oreochromis niloticus* raised in aquariums on different formulated diets for 11 weeks" is not enough to clearly show the result. Maybe it can be presented with a table to give a clearer idea.

Please revise the abstract section. You should provide a basis for mentioning the results. It would be proper if the authors should link the study area welfare.

The discussion section in the present form is relatively weak and should be strengthened with more details and justifications.

Please check for some typo/grammar (few places).

In the conclusion section, the limitations of this study, suggested improvements of this work and future directions should be highlighted.

Mention about limitations of your study if you have any in conclusion section.