



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	My observation is that since no study or experiment was conducted on the subject, except for literature review, this should be treated as “a review paper manuscript” whose title has to be highlighted in that regard. Therefore, I wish to suggest to the author to entitle the manuscript as “A REVIEW OF AQUACULTURAL PRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA OR REVIEW OF AQUACULTURAL PRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA” The manuscript is good, especially in the academic circle as the materials will be of great help to students taking various Aquaculture courses.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author ought to take note of a number of corrections to be made before the manuscript can be considered for publication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In this manuscript some statements made sounded like a protest to the government of the day in that country and had nothing to do with the wider readership he was writing for. My appeal to the author is to focus his/her writing on the global readership perspective, enlighten them on what was happening and where possible highlight some challenges and solutions in a positive manner. The Optional/General comments have highlighted some of the comments that border on ethics in this manuscript. The author of the manuscript is being advised after corrections to subject the document to anti-plagiarism before being re-submitted for publication.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer