



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8353
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF HAPA ON GROWTH, SURVIVAL AND CONDITION FACTOR OF <i>CLARIAS GARIEPINUS</i> FRY IN LARGE VOLUME OF WATER.
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	Line2 : change title to EFFECT OF WATER VOLUME ON GROWTH.....of Clarias gariepinus frys raised in different enclosures. ABSTRACT Line 11: frys were fed AT 5% body weight. No mention was made of the water volume ! Line21: insert Clarias gariepinus in the key words. INTRODUCTION Lines23-25: give the authority for the statement. Line35: Re-cast the statement MATERIALS & METHODS Lines42-43: mention the volume of water and size of the hapa. Lines44-45: Do you feed at 5% body weight 4 time daily ? why ? line54: weights were taking with or using line56-57: siphoning methods according to who? RESULTS AND DISCUSSION line83-87 : re-coin the statement line 83-94: No single citation io support findings ! line96-99: give reasons for your finding(s) ?	Suggested title was effected Corrected Volume was reflected in manuscript Done Done Statement was re-casted Done Feeding with 5% body weight was done to avoid cannibalism Corrected Author inserted in manuscript Statement was reconstructed Improved upon Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The experiment is not properly documented, vital information are missing. Replication in another station may be difficult!	Experiment documentation was improved upon and vital data information included for replication of the experiment as other researchers may deem it fit.