



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<u>Materials and Methods</u> 1. Add more detail on the experimental diets, for instance : Coppens Catfish Crumbles or Catfish Micro Pellets. 2. Please describe feeding ration and feeding frequency. <u>Results and Discussion</u> 1. No details about the instrumentation used in any analysis procedure, which is questionable? 2. Results indicated that there was different in fish growth and survival rate. Is there any different in feed ingredients? More discussion of essential nutrition in feeds should be included in the discussion. 3. Since fat has a sparing effect on protein, it is necessary to discuss in deep. 4. (Line 60-61) The statement "Highest survival rates percentage of 91% and 88% was recorded in Artemia and Lucky star....." is no statistical analysis results to confirm. Please include the standard error and statistical results of survival rate in Table 3. 5. (Line 64-65) "Lovell [7] stated that protein quality of feed can affect the growth performance of fish and protein quality is affected by amino acid composition and digestibility." How and when did you obtain amino acid composition and digestibility of experimental diets?	Thank you for your kind suggestion. Please, see the revised manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<u>Conclusion</u> 1. (Line 97-98) The statement "Artemia shell free which has been used with various level of success for fry rearing. In terms of cost, it is more expensive than Lucky Star feed." It is necessary to show statistical analysis on feed cost per 100 of fry to confirm. 2. (Line 98-99) "Our study showed that Lucky Star fry feed can compete favourable with Artemia in growth performance and survival....." From the result in table 3, it difficult to conclude that you said. Since final weight of fish fed AS was significantly ($P < 0.05$) higher than that of fish fed LS diet. 3. (Line 99-100) It is incorrect to say that "Therefore, Lucky Star fry feed can be employed in <i>C. gariepinus</i> fry feeding in place of Artemia."	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		