



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 <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> 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	The statistical analysis must be repeated using the F-test and follow the least significant difference values, to obtain the best treatment for feeding these fry. (table 2 & 3) The results in table 3 indicates the use of <i>Artemia salina</i> led to more growth and survival% but in conclusion the authors mentioned the use of lucky star is better than the use of <i>Artemia salina</i>, which is right?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The English must be evaluated The data is poor , also the discussion and references are limited and not qualified enough.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The idea is interesting	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Oceanography & Fisheries, Alex, Egypt