



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_35557
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF VARYING PROTEIN LEVELS ON <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> (BURCHELL, 1822) GROWTH, PROTEIN UTILIZATION AND YIELD IN HAPA SYSTEM
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	A minor problem with this work is the design. It is impossible to state that the protein levels you used were comparable. The authors had 50% protein diets but it was made up of over 70% of plant protein source groundnut cake. On this note the 50% protein you claim to use is of less quality than the 40% and 45% protein diets that had higher inclusion levels of fishmeal. The author was varying several ingredients making his feed non standard and unreliable. That a diet is 40% is immaterial if the amino acid content of from lower source that is if it had low amino acid value. More so that plant ingredients have anti nutritional factors which make the protein unavailable to the fish. So using % of protein in feed to judge the growth of the fish is not professional if the amino acids and fatty acids are not considered. Table 1 presented a non reliable protein profile for the feed with 3% fishmeal and soybean meal for F5. This is very poor for socalled 50% protein feed. The authors fed fish at 5% body weight but did not tell us how it was done since 5% body weight changes periodically and needs constant adjustment. How was it done? The FCR is too low 0.28 on the average and at that the SGR cannot be 3.0% Something is wrong somewhere and the result is questionable. At such low FCR the SGR must be much more higher than 3%. However the rest of the calculations should be rdone and the work re written. The authors wrote... The experimental design was made up of a module consisting of 8.5m x 6.5m bamboo raft with sixteen 1.5m x 1.5m apartment fittable with 1m x 1m x 1m hapa placed on the concrete tank. Each hapa was rigged and suspended to maintain a depth of 0.75m in water and a free board of 0.25m. The float lines were tied to the four corners of each compartment using kuralon rope (No 51 15) as described by Otubusin (2000). This gives a very vague idea on the experimental set up. There is no way anybody can determine how the experiment was set up. They said hapa was used and said concrete ponds were used. Now if concrete ponds were used how many hapa were inside each pond? How many concrete ponds were used? These questioned were not answered by the materials and methods and source of water supply and the physic chemical parameters of the water used. The authors must re write the materials and	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	methods and the results. More over the authors stated as follows... Generally, there was an inverse relationship between protein level and growth 104 performance of fish This cannot be substantiated by the level of work and analysis done in this work. There was no regression analysis and there is no R^2 value to prove the claim. How can they say so when the 40% protein had better ingredients than the 50%.I rcommend re analysis of the diets because the results of F5 proximate analyses is showing that groundnut meal has 50% protein approximately. The PER is very high and seems to need recalculations.	
Minor REVISION comments	The references are old and newest is 7years old. There is need for complete overhaul of this work to make it publishable	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Enyidi U.D
Department, University & Country	Nigeria