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 Clarias gariepinus JUVENILES FED DIFFERENTLY PROCESSED SUNFLOWER (Helianthus annuus 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 - As Major Revisions were needed, the comments are written bellow.

	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	This manuscript is about the responses of *Clarias gariepinus* when fed with sunflower seed in different treatments. It is a good manuscript to be published due to the importance of aquaculture and its costs. It has potential to be a good manuscript but it needs several and serious revisions. I suggest it may be accepted with major considerations or rejected for latter submission. In the introduction some points are missing, the explanation of why using sunflower seeds as an option for feeding, why it affect the costs and when this was first used in aquaculture. The Materials and Methods present points that were not clear and become questionable. First, were the treatments randomized? And second, did you use only males in the experiment? If not, differences between sexes should be tested, considering that males and females even that receive equivalent amounts of energy they invest it in different ways. The sections Biological Evaluation, Statistical Analysis, Results and Discussion should be serious revised considering some points are missing, repeated and mixed subject can be found between them, especially between results and	

	discussion. Follow the specific corrections and suggestions: Introduction: Lines 47-54 are unnecessary and should be traded by the explanation you choose the sunflower seed in the experiment. Also this part is not referenced. Include the author and year of the species description, according to taxonomic rules. Example: *Clarias gariepinus* (Burchell, 1822) Biological Evaluation: This section should be better explained. For what each index is for with a short description of each and its references. Lines 154-168 are repeated. Analytical Methods: Describe the method of the Association of Official Analytical Chemist Statistical Analysis: Tests assumptions are missing. Which are the variables for each case and what is the objective of the tests, what do you expect founding? In this section the sex of the fish should be strongly considered. Results:	This observation has been effected. Line 154- 168 have been corrected and the index of each biological evaluation can be seen in table 5. short description is not necessary under materials and methods Full description is not necessary, since there is citation (AOAC 2000). Whoever that need full description can consult the citation so as to avoid lengthy write up. Test assumptions are not missing. This manuscript has a focus and the focus have been achieved. The reviewer view seems to be quiet different from our view.

	This is the most critical section and it should be re written. The tables and graphics presented are satisfactory, but they should be described. The results for each index that was tested should be presented, minimum and maximum values, which treatment presented better performance and which were the water parameters that were the most affected. The results of the statistical tests should be presented also in text not only in tables, only the letters are confused. Figure 01 - Improve the Image Quality	The observations have been effected.
	Discussion: This section presents a mix with results and discussion, separate them and this will be a good section.	The observations have been effected
	References: These references have “a” or “b” in the citation but is the only one for the authors, remove the letters. Khan MN, Perveen M, Rab A, Afzal M, Sahar L, Ali MR and Naqvi SM. Effect of replacement of fish meal by soybean and sunflower meals in the diet of Cyprinus carpio fingerlings. Pakistan J. Biol. Sci., 2003b, 6: 601–604.	The corrections in the reference section have been effected based on the reviewer comments.

	Mukhopadhyay N, Ray AK. Effect of fermentation on the nutritive value of sesame seed meal in the diets for rohu (Labeo rohita Hamilton) fingerlings. Aquaculture Nutrition 1999a, 5: 229–236. Sahzadi et al. (2006) is cited in the text line 426 but it is not referenced. These references are in the section references but its citations are missing in the text: Burel C, Boujard T, Tulli F, Kaushik SJ. Digestibility of extruded pea, extruded lupin and rapeseed meals in rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) and turbot (Psetta maxissa). Aquaculture 2000¸188: 285-298. Duffus CM, Duffus JH. In: D'Mello, F.J.P., Duffus, C.M. and Duffus, J.H. (Eds.), Toxic Substances in Crop Plants. The Royal Society of Chemistry, Thomas Graham House, Science Park, Cambridge CB4 4WF, Cambridge, 1991, Pp. 1–21. Liener IE. Antinutritional factors in legume seeds: state of the art. In: Huisman, J., Van der Poel, A.F.B. and Liener, I.E. (Eds.), Recent Advances of Research in Antinutritional Factors in Legume Seeds. Pudoc, Wageningen, 1989, Pp. 6–14.	

	Richardson NL, Higgs DA, Beames RM, McBride JR. Influence of dietary calcium, phosphorus, zinc and sodium phytate level on cataract incidence, growth and histopathology in juvenile Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha). J. Nutr. 1985, 115: 553–567.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		