



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15321
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF Gliricidia sepium (Jacq) LEAF MEAL SUPPLEMENTED WITH ENZYME (ROXAZYME G2) ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE OF Clarias gariepinus Burchell, 1822
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper deals with the study of the effect of the addition of <i>Gliricidia sepium</i> leaf and enzyme Roxazyme G2 on <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> feeding treatments. In particular on growth performance of <i>C. Gariepinus</i> fingerlings. It is an interesting research that needs some improvements . As a general observation, there are many words together that need the incorporation of a space in between, please note that. I found a few grammatical mistakes that will be indicated in each section, as well as a few comments:	Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: FCE abbreviation is not defined. Feeding treatments (T1, T2, T3 and T4) are not defined either. I'm afraid that 10% <i>G. sepium</i>+ enzyme (T3) is not the best choice to enhance <i>C. Gariepinus</i> growth performance, since better results were found employing 15% of leaf + enzyme. Did you mean T4? Please check that. Introduction: Introduction is well written, a main objective is well pointed out, and the background adequate. Line 33: change word by world Line 34: change militating for mitigating Lines 35-39: this sentence is too long and confusing, please re-write it. Line 43: change "with a satisfactory results" by with satisfactory results Materials and methods: Materials and methods are well	Corrected. Yes, two enzymes were used. The was omission of the second enzyme (Maxigrain).T4 gave best performance with 10% of leaf and maxigrain. Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	described and complete. Methodology is adequate for the study. Lines 60, 65, 88, 130 and table 5: Please be careful when indicating temperatures use °C instead of cero (°C) or only C, the same for latitude and longitude data (line 58) Lines 59-60: Onakomaiya et al., 1972 might be a very old study to describe environmental features, cite a more recent paper or erase that sentence. Line 64: leaves were exposed to the sun? Maybe you could freeze dry you samples instead, a suggestion for the future. Line 67: change supplement for supplemented, and efficacy for efficiency. Lines 69-71: this sentence is a bit confusing, please re-write it. Lines 76, 85: numbers between brackets are not necessary. Line 81: if 300 individuals were placed in 12 containers, it means that 3 replicates of each treatment were available. In addition, if mortality was equal to cero M=0 (as indicated in table 4), it means that you had N=75 for each feeding treatment right? Please explain how many replicates you used and number of individuals used for statistical analysis, sample size is not available and it important to mention that. Table 1: T4 change 10 % glicidia leaf meal by 15 % <i>Gliricidia sepium</i> leaf meal I think you should define feeding treatments in mat and met section in addition to the information provided in table 1. Also please re-arrange table 1 putting all together constant components of each feeding treatment and the ones that are different between treatments T1, T2, T3 and T4 (leaf meal, enzyme and fish meal).	Corrected Okay Corrected Corrected I used 3 replicates Two enzymes were used .
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results: Line 111: change "content is" for content was Lines 110-112: first sentence is very confusing the use of abbreviations makes interpretation very difficult. Lines 124-125: According to table 4, mortality was zero in all the treatments, no need for statistical analysis, just write that. Also please choose M or MOR for mortality use only one notation. Tables: please make sure that table legends contain definition for all the abbreviations you used. Table 4: include number of samples used (N=75 in each treatment?) and erase Mortality since resulted zero in all treatments. Discussion: Line 135: change closed for close Line 143: ANF is not defined Conclusion: I don't understand why you recommend 10% <i>G. sepium</i> (T3) since for example WG did not result different from T1 (without <i>G. sepium</i> or enzymes), I guess you meant T4 15% <i>G. sepium</i> + enzyme, please correct that.	Corrected Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		