



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 Clariasgariepinus 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>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 7 – stocked not socked Line 12- fry fed NOT feed Line 52 – The study compared the growth response and survival rate of Clariasgariepinus fry fed NOT fry different commercially formulated feed (remove fry) 28 days. Line 56 - C. gariepinusfry (remove fry) Line 57 – fed NOT feed Line 63 – recast entire sentence fry fed these depends on their composition, texture, flavour or mixture of these factors (which factors?) Line 71 – this statement is superfluous since the author already gave reason why feed with low crude protein did better than those with high crude protein see line 70. Therefore, line 71 can be removed. Line 97- the author mentioned about cost differential between Lucky Star and Artemia, however, the study did not consider this and as such it is a mere assumption.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdullahi M. Orire
Department, University & Country	Aquaculture and Fisheries Technology, Federal University of Technology, Nigeria