



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6129
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of Artemia (Brine shrimp) and Ceriodaphnia (Zooplankton) as foods for catfish larvae
Type of the Article	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	Abstract 1. Remove 'Growth and survival records were taken weekly. After 21 days of rearing, % Survival, Specific growth rate (SGR), daily growth rate (DGR) and Percentage weight gain (PWG) ' replace with 'Growth indices such as Percentage Survival (PS), Specific Growth Rate (SGR), Daily Growth Rate (DGR) and Percentage Weight Gain (PWG) were determined weekly. At the end of the experiment, PS, SGR, DGR and PWG 2. The abstract is not well concluded. Kindly conclude with results that give you best performance. 3. The scientific name of the fish in keywords should be written in full. Introduction 1. There is problem with the way you express your statement of problem (line 59 -68), is confusing. 2. Remove according to research findings, the (line 44), write report instead of reported in line 54 3. Let there be clarity in the knowledge gap. Also, kindly reduced and reframe the introduction. Materials and methods 1. Remove 'The experiment carried out to reflect the aim of the study was conducted at	Done Done Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the fish hatchery complex of Lagos state University, Ojo.' 2. Under statistical analysis 'mean of parameters' should be removed and written as parameters such as..... (mention the parameters)	Done
	Results 1. I suggest that the author should remove 'table 2 and 3' they reflect the same thing with table 4 2. Kindly subject the followings in table 4 to statistical analysis: SGR = Specific growth rate K = Condition factor DGR = Daily growth rate, PWG = Percentage weight gain 3 Re- arrange your table, after table 1, the next table should be proximate composition of the experimental diets and finally the growth performance table and give a brief explanation of your results.	Done
	Discussion 1. Remove (table 2,3and 4) 2. Remove heavier and write higher 3. Replace this 'Analysis of variance (ANOVA) also reveals slight significant difference in length but wider significant difference in weight ($P<0.05$) between the three fish larvae fed <i>Ceriodaphnia</i> and <i>Artemia</i>' with 'the results of this study shows significant difference($P<0.05$) in weight and length the three fish larvae fed <i>Ceriodaphnia</i> and <i>Artemia</i>' 4. Remove this 'The findings above point to the fact that <i>Ceriodaphnia</i> performed better than <i>Artemia</i> nauplii in the growth of <i>C. gariepinus</i>, <i>Heterobranchus bidorsalis</i> and <i>Heteroclaris</i>	Done

	larvae and replace with results of the present study shows that <i>Ceriodaphnia</i> performed better than <i>Artemia nauplii</i> in the growth of <i>C. gariepinus</i>, <i>Heterobranchus bidorsalis</i> and <i>Heteroclarus</i> larvae 5. Remove in spite of the fact that and (table 5) 6. write C.P in full References 1. The author should follow the AJEA author guide in writing the references.	Done Done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The author of this manuscript should go through the manuscript again and make appropriate correction so that the beauty of this research work will come out.	Done