



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This review article deals with Aquacultural production and management in Nigeria as correctly stated in the title. It is interesting and reads smoothly, however, there are revisions that should be carried out in order to make it more adherent to the territorial situation. I advice to make the following changes: The paragraph "Status of aquaculture in Nigeria" is quite shallow. I would add the trend of production, at least since 2000 and would specify the amount of species produced. Move the paragraph "Fish species grown in Nigeria" soon after the "Status of aquaculture in Nigeria" and rewrite the first paragraph (Fishes are diverse group..... up to Green, 2008; lines 110-115). It reads like common journal or newspaper. Please, make it sound more "scientific". The paragraph "Status of aquaculture in Nigeria" should provide information about the aquaculture techniques adopted to farm the species reported and how such techniques can be improved. According to the paragraph there are basically three farmed species: tilapia, catfish and carp. However, it is not clear whether they "are" cultured (line 116) or "can be" cultured (line 118 and 128). Please, clarify. Please, clarify the meaning of ineffective aquaculture	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	extension service system (lines 103-104) and ...energy and water quality.... (lines 107-108), it is not clear the relationship between energy and water quality related problems and the skills gap in the industry.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 211 , a reference is needed. Please add: Paolucci, M., Fabbrocini, A., Volpe, M.G., Varricchio, E., Coccia, E., 2012. Development of biopolymers as binders for feed for farmed aquatic organisms, in: Muchlisin, Z.A., (Ed.), Aquaculture, Vol. 1, InTech, (ISBN 979-953-307-107-6), Open access publisher.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article is interesting but generic. Once again I strongly suggest to integrate it with data that reflect the territorial situation.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marina Paolucci
Department, University & Country	Department of Sciences and Technologies , University of Sannio, Italy