



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_16342
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Three-Different Commercial Feed on the Growth and Survival of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> Fry in Aquaria Glass Tanks.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- In general, the present manuscript: "Impact of three-different commercial feed on the growth and survival of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> fry in aquaria glass tanks" addressed to compare the growth response and survival rates of <i>C. gariepinus</i> fry fed artificially formulated fry using Artemia as control, and it is interesting. On the other hand, there is great necessity of improvement due to some mistakes, misunderstandings, and information lack in all sections of this manuscript. In general, this current manuscript needs serious major revision. There are some spelling problems along the manuscript, and the English needs to be revised and improved. - Abstract: 1) a concise and factual abstract is required and the abstract is usually written in a single paragraph. 2) Additionally, several information lack in this section, mainly about "Methodology", as such as: commercial fish feed (supply, supplier); feeding period (daily? How many times?); aquaria glass system (with or without water circulation? Water renewal?). 3) Furthermore, provide more results in this section, because, you have more important results than you added. 4) Besides, provide more numerical and quantitative data in this section.	Revised manuscript has been updated with the suggested information. Thank you.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Introduction: 1) the introduction is short and could be further explored in relation to <i>C. gariepinus</i> biology (very well documented in the literature), and focusing on the importance of this study. 2) Furthermore, there is considerable information available about <i>C. gariepinus</i> in various spheres of reproduction science (as such as, reproduction, embryology, larval survive, feeding larvae, among other), and it is believed that you are able to get this information. 3) It is necessary to provide this information in introduction section, showing which gap you are filling with your work as well as its importance. Please, provide it? - Material and Methods: 1) about the methodologies employed, I have my serious doubts (some details see below) whether the methods applied are adequate to reach the objectives of manuscript. Additionally, several information lacks is observed. Review the entire manuscript. 2) The experimental was performed in aquaria glass during 28 days. During this period occurred water renovation? Aquaria glass has water recirculation (with or without recirculation)? Aquaria glass has a filter (mechanic or biology)? Any substratum (like: gravel, sand, plants)? 3) How temperature was kept constant (higher with little variation)? 4) Photoperiod? Because, several catfish species showed photophobia. 5) How survival rate was calculated? 6) How growth response and feed efficiency were evaluated? 7) It is necessary to supply the data about experimental diets (suppliers;	Revised manuscript has been updated with the suggested information. Thank you. Thank you for your kind suggestion. Please, see the revised manuscript.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	who performed the analyses about crude protein, crude fat, moisture, among other parameter supply in the Table 1?). 8) Supply data about commercial fish food used to feed the fish (Coppens, Durante and Luck Star). 9) How many times the animals were fed (dairy? How many times? How much was supplied?)? 10) Data about <i>Artemia salina</i> is necessary (supplier; how it is provided? Artemia newly hatched?) 11) <i>Artemia salina</i> shell free? How was obtained? 12) In general, catfish showed nocturnal habits. These fish were fed during the night or only during the day? 13) Furthermore, catfish showed cannibalism. In the present experiment this behaviour was observed? If yes, quantified? 14) In the abstract section, the author reported that the each experimental treatment was replicated three times. On the other hand, in the Material and Methods did not mention this. 15) Initial data about the animals used in this study (weight, length), as well as, the water parameters. 16) The data showed in the present study were mean +/- mean standard deviation or mean +/- mean standard error? This information is necessary to describe here (Statistical analyses). - Results and Discussion: about the results showed, I have some doubts (see some details below). 1) The first sentence described in the results section (about period of 28 days of experiment) and average means (initial data), these are information about Material and Methods (move these information to Material and Methods). 2) About the survival rates:	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	there are necessary to provide the mean +/- mean standard deviation or mean +/- mean standard error. 3) I agree with you, there was no significant difference among Coppens and Durante with Artemia and Lucky Star (about final weight). On the other hand, Artemia and Luck Star there was difference (according the Table 3). In this sense, how the authors conclude that the Lucky Star fry feed can be employed in place Artemia (if Artemia is better than Lucky Star)? 4) The data collected about survival rate were subjected to statistical analyses? There are differences among the samples? 5) Discussion: please read carefully and discuss appropriately. 6) Furthermore, if the authors make the suggested corrections and alterations and read the some literature, they will probably be able to improve results/discussion afterwards.	Thank you for your kind suggestion. They have added in the revised manuscript. Please, see the revised manuscript.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- The manuscript is well structured and written, although revision by a native English speaker and/or English editing service is recommended before the return for a other revision (as it is written now, it is difficult to understand what the author means in several parts of this manuscript). - Normally, the first time that the species was cited in the manuscript, describes the complete name (genus and species), later, you need to abbreviate the genus. In this sense, use "Clarias gariepinus" once, then just "C. gariepinus". The review of the entire manuscript is necessary.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		