

Editor's Comment:

I did not see any review form, but I send my observations.

1. The information is very interesting but the authors did not write well in English. Maybe they need to send to mother tongue translator to obtain better manuscript. It is very difficult to understand it at first read.
2. If the manuscript is about using a different concentration of leaves to pellets floatability, the authors need to focus on it. Because they are not making a study about acceptability on fishes or making a new fish diet.
3. The authors only made a comparison with wheat grain. They need to compare with others fish pellets to make better discussion.
4. I do not understand water stability process. Why authors make it? To obtain what?
5. The manuscript need a lot of scientific work to make better manuscript.

THE AUTHORS WRITE:

1. Mistakes in English were observed and well corrected. I rewrite title and abstract, if you can see, I make a lot of changes because is a very bad English written manuscript. that's why I write is very difficult to read it, and understand.
2. After the formulation of the diets, proximate analysis was conducted and there was no significant difference with the commercial feeds recommended for fish. it is okay if the authors make a study about the effect of those fish feed pellets in fishes (length and weight). But they are making only a study about floating and stability.
3. Other discussions (with Wheat grain, cassava starch and water crushed melon shell) has been discussed.
4. Water stability was conducted to see how far the nutrient is transferred to the fish without disintegration. It also helps to know the total amount of nutrient leached into the water. Baobab leaf has a sickening effect which helps to compact the feed together making it impermeable for water to penetrate for some minutes as stated in the result. Because when water penetrates, much nutrients will be leached into the water. If authors make a better search on the Internet about floating and stability of fish pellets, they can find a lot of manuscripts. Most recently is this PhD Thesis.
5. More scientific work has been done. I write the same thing. The information is good, but the authors need better lead to write it.
I did not see many changes in the manuscript.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Jorge Castro Mejia

Department of El Hombre Y Su Ambiente, Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana Xochimilco,
Mexico