



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</a>                                                                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJEA_19984                                                                                                                    |
| Title of the Manuscript: | MOLECULAR CHARACTERIZATION AND HAEMOLYSIS OF BACTERIA ASSOCIATED WITH <i>Tilapia zilli</i> FROM IJAKA-OKE LOCATION ON YEWA RIVER |
| 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**

|                                            | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | <b>Author's comment</b> (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)                                                                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | The article in general is well written but they need to review some bacterial name for sample <i>Morganella morgani</i> they wrote <i>Morganella morgana</i> , also they wrote <i>spp</i> the correct form is <i>spp.</i> ,                                                                                                                                                  | THE NAMES OF BACTERIA WRONGLY SPELT HAVE BEEN CORRECTED.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | Result are good but but in My opinion they need more explanation about RAPD<br>This paper reports the RAPD molecular fingerprinting and they need have some explication about intra-specific diversity index.<br>What do they used for the structure of the phenogram?<br>it is necessary to have data RAPD with a similar statistical treatment to have a comparison point. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION ABOUT RAPD HAS BEEN GIVEN, SEE LINES 74 – 76.</li> <li>- THE DATA COLLECTED FOR THE PHEOTYPES WERE USED TO STRUCTURE THE PHENOGRAM WITH THE AID OF THE COMPUTER</li> <li>- THE STUDY WAS NOT A COMPARATIVE STUDY AND SO DATA WERE NOT COLLECTED FOR SOME OTHER TREATMENTS</li> </ul> |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | Whilst this is a good discussion but need to recent studies for comparison                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |