



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6622
Title of the Manuscript:	HAEMATOLOGICAL AND BIOCHEMICAL CHANGES IN AFRICAN CATFISH, <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> FED WALNUT (<i>Tetracarpidium conophorum</i> Mull Arg) LEAF AND ONION (<i>Allium cepa</i> Linn) BULB SUPPLEMENTED DIETS
Type of the Article	Research 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>)



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	In abstract; - the author must detailed the following groups "OB2 (0.5%), OB3 (1.0%), OB4 (1.5%), OB5 (2.0%), WL6 (0.5%), - WL7 (1.0%), WL8 (1.5%) and WL9 (2.0%)." - Red bold and white blood cell must be plural "cells"> - I see that walnut leaf must be wall nut leaves. - The author should provide a conclusion in the abstract, the provided one is not clear. In the result: - I see the author must describe the obtained results in a paragraph (s) showing the table only is not satisfactory. In discussion: the author must clarify which treatment provided for fish in the following sentence " Also, Azza <i>et al.</i>, (2009) recorded that the erythrocyte-count was significantly higher with treated groups than the control."	The observations have been effected The observations have been effected The observations have been effected
Minor REVISION comments	In results part:	To my best of knowledge I believe that when result is presented without brief discussion



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Clarias gariepinus should be deleted from the title as the whole ms is concerned on it.	there is no need to have headings/topic but, in the case where you have result with brief discussion it is necessary to have the headings/ topic. Sir, I feel that we should sustain the <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> in the result so as to bring out the beauty of the work.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- No need for the testing fish before experiment, provide some confusion.	One may and may not test before the experiment. But, when test is performed before experiment its allow you to compare the control and the values obtained before experiment and after the experiment.