



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_19405
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCT QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF CLARIAS GARIEPINUS FED DIETARY LEVELS OF AZADIRACHTA INDICA LEAF MEAL.
Type of the 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 the abstract and methodology I recommend the experimental design of aquaria lay out be outlined e.g. CRD,CRBD e.t.c. this helps further studies can be done elsewhere to replicate the present study. ➤ In the Abstract I recommend the software used for data analysis be mentioned(SPSS) ➤ I recommend that the data be re-analysed using a newer version of SPSS i.e. probably version 16 or latest version. Why using the old version SPSS (7.5)?????? ➤ Please indicate that it was one way ANOVA it helps better replication elsewhere. ➤ Why using AOAC 1995 for proximate analysis when there are newer ways like AOAC 2000 or 2003. Please revisit this.	Noted, CRD was used. Right and effected Right. I forgot I have long upgraded to SPSS (version 15). Action effected. It was one way ANOVA Please accept this method as used.



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	➤ Please indicate how the feed was formulated i.e. what method was used e.g. trial and error, Pearson square or software win feed etc. linear programming??????	Trial and error method was used.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	DISCUSSION ➤ Please account for a 52. % mortality rate for diets 2 and 3. I strongly agree that at the rate of 52. % it alarming. What if it's commercial farming? Is the farmer still going to make profit? Justify the reasons for this alarming rate and suggest ways of avoiding the same. ➤ You claim crude protein increased with increase in the leaf inclusion. And you have made a sweeping statement that it could have resulted from better nutrients. As a scientist this shows lack of critical analysis. I would have expected that you were going to conduct any amino acid test for the leaf to back up your claim. If you can please conduct an amino acid and fatty acid test to help you justify your argument. If not do massive literatures search for the same? ➤ Again what about the ant nutritional factors present in the leaf. ????? If the author may he /she conduct the study to help her discussion.	This study is not focused on mortality, but the high rate of mortality necessitated our reporting the mortality aspect. While we have made input on this and suggestions, it would have certainly provoked a fresh study on this mortality issue. Please see the revised manuscript. 'The sweeping statement' I agree may be wrong choice of word. However several factors may have influenced our observation eg. nutrient balance and utilization. We have made a major revision on this. We couldn't go far into amino acid and fatty acid test. Please see manuscript and references.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	I feel most proximate composition results i.e. for lipid, fibre, moisture, crude protein have not been explained fully, they have just been reported and compared to previous work of different leaf done elsewhere. I recommend a major overhaul of the discussion which not only compares results but make a case for the results. What does the result mean to the body of aquaculture nutrition science? What is the link between proximate results to body carcass for the fish . What is the take home message!?????	Anti nutritional factors have been addressed in the revised manuscript. A major revision has been effected, see revised manuscript. Take home message to the body of aquaculture nutrition science is that <i>Azadirachta indica</i> leaf meal as feed ingredient in the diets of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i>, had no deteriorating effect on carcass composition and product quality of the fish.
--	--	---