



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6207
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH RESPONSE AND NUTRIENT UTILIZATION OF <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> JUVENILES FED DIFFERENTLY PROCESSED SUNFLOWER (<i>Helianthus annuus</i> L) SEED MEAL-BASED DIETS.
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	Abstract Line 19: re-coin the statement Line22 : delete "others" preceeding sunflower meal Line23: change "higher" to superior Line28: delete "we concluded" and insert, the result from this study indicated/suggested Line30: delete all statements after UTILIZATION Line33: remove water quality and insert JUVENILE Introduction/materials & methods Line39: what do you mean by ELSEWHERE ? Line66: is the water source TAP or WELL ? Line67:how many aerators and their capacities? Line77: is there need to consider feeding time ? why? Line 121: At what stage was Chromium oxide added and why ? RESULTS/DISCUSSION Line382: No table was shown to indicate you carried out digestibility study ! which authority was adopted? Line389: No table to show effect of processing on anti-nutrients ? No authority cited for the lower values in processed sunflower seed meals ! Lines412-421: statements were vague , very unscientific ! no citations to back findings . Line439: Net protein utilization may not be same as apparent digestibility . the use of "indicator" chromium oxide not justified.	Abstract - The reviewer observations have been effected expect 'others' in line 22 which I can not removed because it compared result of the different processing sunflower seed meal. - Also, it is better to use 'higher' in when comparing values to superior 'suggested' by the reviewer. So, I can not replace 'higher' for 'superior' in line 23 - Juvenile can not be inserted in the keywords since <i>Clarias Gariepinus</i> is already in the keywords Introduction/ materials and methods - The reviewer observations have been effected, feeding time was not consider but we only mention the period we fed the fish. - Chromium oxide was added at the beginning of the experiment so as so evaluate feed utilization by <i>C. gariepinus</i> Results / Discussion - Table 2 indicate effect of processing of anti nutrients factors and authority was



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Please over-haul the discussion entirely to make this work meaningful academically.	sited to back up our findings. • Line 412- 421 have been effected with citation to back the findings. • Finally, the discussion have been revised has suggested by the reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This work is only good as acadeic exercise but not for the yearning of our farmers towards food security and aquaculture development. The yield of sunflower seed per hectare would have been meaningful to justify availability . Seasonality is another consideration.	