



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8082
Title of the Manuscript:	AQUACULTURAL PRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This article is not scientifically robust and technically sound. It also failed to contribute to knowledge; The paper is without objective and focus. It lacks originality and current aqua cultural issues and development in Nigeria. This article requires serious and complete rework NOTE; All highlighted words in Yellow need attention, red are meant for delete while suggestion are in bracket	The objective is stated now. Most of the articles and data used are from recent journals. I have gone through other reviewers' comments and accepted most of their suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Author(s) can include table/charts and sub headings like: • Nigeria population and fish demand • Introduction of cage culture in Nigeria • Contribution of government and private sector • Problem and prospect of aquaculture in Nigeria, etc	Okay.