



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	Line 27 Introduction – No justification/reasons were giving in the 'Introduction' for using AILM as alternate protein source in this study. This is important since it is the main test ingredient. Line 67 – Where were the fish acclimatized and what were they fed during the 7 days? Line 77 – what was the method by Kekeocha (2001) and what actually was it used for? It is not clear the way it is stated. Line 79 – What training was given to the taste panel? This was not explained. Line 73-75 – It was stated that the trial took 56 days and samples were taken bi-weekly to determine proximate composition of fish samples. However, there are no bi-weekly results showing trends over the period. Line 95 – The proximate composition normally adds up to 100% but the values in Table 2 are short of 100% [(Moisture + crude protein + ash + crude fibre + ether extract + NFE) = 100%]. Line 107 – The title of Table 3 should rather read as 'Water parameters' instead of 'Limnological parameters'. Mean values in Table 3 should be provided	Action has been taken on this, see revised manuscript. Action taken. In concrete pond and fed control diet AOAC (1995) methods; highlighted also in kekeocha (2001). Organoleptic assessment skill. We used the means. Our interest for the biweekly prox. analysis was for spread and also enough observations for the one way ANOVA to compare the treatments. It was computation error and has been corrected. Action effected, see revised manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with standard deviations (SD) or standard errors (SE) and also the number of replicates used for analysis indicated. In fact, this goes for all mean values in the manuscript i.e. Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. Line 114 – In Table 4 superscripts indicating significant difference for the Lipid values seem to be wrongly assigned (authors should check and correct). Line 124 – Ash content higher for Diets 1 and 4 not Diets 1 and 3.	Action effected. Corrected Corrected
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 1 line 9-10 - What other protein sources were used? Line 63 Table 1 – Protein levels were exactly 36% in all the diets. That is rather interesting. Were the values calculated or really analyzed? Line 90 - which Table? Do you expect up to 15% inclusion of AIM to give any differences in quality? What informed the inclusion levels selected? Line 129 – In the method a ‘6 point assessment chart score’ was mentioned but the results in Table 5 show 1-5 points (I am not sure if this is 6 points) Line 157 – 159 - Are dietary fibres digestible by fish? In animals where dietary fibre may be digestible , does it lead to higher fibre in the flesh of the animal?	Fish meal Proximate analysis of the test feedstuff (<i>Azadirachta indica</i> leaf meal) and dietary feeds were carried out. Table1 Upto 15% inclusion level of AILM has been used in some species of animals and we considered it appropriate on catfish with omnivorous feeding habit. 1-5 is the number of independent test assessors. Balanced fiber content in diets I believe can aid feed utilization and conversion efficiency in species of animals.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The justification for conducting this study is not clear, particularly the use of <i>Azadirachta indica</i> leaf meal (AILM). Generally, the methods used were not well described so difficult to follow and this makes some of the results seem a bit doubtful.	Revision has been made on this. I strongly believe that with the answers to the comments, every doubt is resolved.