



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_42867
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth responses of Hybrid Clariid Catfish Hybrid (Clarias gariepinus ♀ X Heterobranchus bidosarlis ♂) fingerlings fed diets containing dietary Lablab Bean Meal (Lablab Purpureus)
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change title as suggested. • Abstract: Inconsistent and vague. No recommendation/conclusion • Line 9: No mention on the %CP of diets BUT only mentioned isonitrogenous! • Line 12: Give Authority to naming HYBRID "heteroclarias" e.g Clarias gariepinus, Burchell 1822? • Table 3 showed nutrients in feed poor, hence utilization. The best diet D2 had FCR of 1.86 in fingerlings nutrition very incredible! meaning the feed/diets cannot support profitable aquaculture. Similar observation for SGR which is below the recommended for Clariid catfish to be average of 2.0% per day. • Line 36 -38: State how you removed lignin since you are feeding monogastric. <p>MATERIALS & METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 57, Give authority for toasting for 25 minutes specifically? • Line 66: you did not mention the die of pelletizer or pellet size that influences feed intake. • Line 70 -71: Fish were raised in plastic containers (30x 36 x52cm) indoor doesn't make research adaptive to farmers! Hapa of 1x1x1m outdoor is recommended in future. • No table to show the phytochemistry of test feedstuff before and after processing to ascertain the efficacy of toasting for 25mins. What temperature was used for the toasting to determine possible effect on nutrients (EAAs)? • Line 150-154: What's the amino acid profile of test ingredient vis-à-vis soybean since no synthetic EAAs fortification in this study? • No mention on method of digestibility study in materials and methods BUT was reported in line 171 in discussion! • Follow the journal format for referencing 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The work is a suitable for publication if all corrections are effected	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Adekola O. Atanda</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria</i>