SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_9118**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Utilization of Dicalcium phosphate and different Bone meals as Dietary phosphorus Supplement in the Diets of Clarias gariepinus Fingerlings**
Type of the Article	**original**

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	1- Abstract conclusion does not match with title. 2- Check lordosis definition (line 26). To my knowledge, lordosis means excessive inward curvature of the spine. 3- Line 83, all tables: remove unneeded decimal places. 4- Why plates 1 to 4 are needed? 5- Line 106. Consider using MWG (g) = Wt - Wi instead of Wi-Wt. 6- Line 126: remove "below". 7- Table 2, NFE? 8- Table 3 and Table 4: DO? 9- Discussion starts on line 182 (remove from line 173 to 181). It must improve discussion (focus on title, objectives and conclusions). 10- Line 192 is not a study conclusion. 11- Lines 193 to 195 are discussion. 12- Lines 197 to 200 are also discussion. 13- Make a direct and simple conclusion. 14- Line 208: 3118? 15- Check all references form. 16- The weakest part of the manuscript is the discussion.	
Minor REVISION comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

	ok	
Optional/General comments	ok	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Brazil**