

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"

Avishek Bardhan¹

¹ West Bengal University of Animal and Fishery Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although the work seems apt in countries like Zimbabwe, where the upsurge in feed costs may lead to financial problems, there are several ethical factors that might play a considerable role in the study. Among most of the questions aroused, using pig blood and fish gut might serve as a vector in the transfer of pathogens of zoonotic importance. The authors decided to study the amount of coliforms in the study, albeit with no discussion of that part. I personally feel that too much data has been generated within the manuscript and visualization is minimal. Try to cover up for extensive tabulation with prompt visualization (using graphs). Not all data that is presented in tables needs to be known to readers. You can provide the same as supplementary tables, making the manuscript more apt.

Nonetheless, there should be extensive modifications in English grammar and sentence construction. Try using editing software that is freely available on the Internet. Also, the references pointed out and cited within the manuscript are too old, and so is the data on production. I believe that this paper was written long back. Henceforth, if you wish to submit this for review, extensive modifications and up-to-date data and citations need to be provided. Among many parameters a reviewer checks within the manuscript, making it worthy for peer review, this is a crucial factor. Please abide by that.

The authors checked energy values, growth rates, FCR, and many more, which are crucial for the study. However, the authors didn't mention a lot of crucial details within the manuscript, maybe because it was overlooked. Some points are mentioned below.

1. Why was this age group of fish used in this study? Elucidate more on this matter.
2. Why was the starvation done for 48 hours?
3. What feed was provided to the fish during acclimation?
4. Proximate analysis could have been represented in a better way.
5. Why were commercial feed samples tested for coliforms? Why weren't the results discussed?
6. Why was *E. coli* chosen? There are several other fecal coliforms. Elucidate this aspect.
7. The Introduction section needs a thorough revision.

Due to these extensive modifications required up to the results section, the discussion section hasn't been reviewed. I believe the authors are capable of a thorough revision in this aspect.



Regards,