



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_31656
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects Of Bleeding And Gutting Procedures On The Nutritional Value Of Smoke- Dried Clarias Gariepinus Under Storage At Room Temperature
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>In abstract</b>-fresh fish samples was; 18 moisture content which ranged from 52.00 ± 2000% (sample D)- check the values</li> <li>2. Why author specifically select bleeding and gutting procedures for this study, explain this in introduction section</li> <li>3. Author did the nutritional value of the fishes initial and after storage in ambient temperature. So the methodology for the nutrient determination explained briefly</li> <li>4. Table 3 shows the nutritional value- check the table number</li> <li>5. Result section – need to improve both writing and presentation</li> <li>6. Similar results were obtained 201 by Daramola, <i>et al.</i> (2007) and Kumolu-Johnson <i>et al.</i> (2010) who worked on <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> and Egbal <i>et al.</i> (2010) who worked on <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> and <i>Clarias lazera</i>.- mentioned the values</li> <li>7. Need to include the more reference and reason for increasing the protin content in sample D</li> <li>8. <b>Ash and NFE content – need to explain more about reduction or increases</b></li> <li>9. <b>Author did any sensory analysis?</b></li> <li>10. The increase in ash and crude fibre can be</li> </ol>	Thank you. I have made the necessary corrections



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>attributed to an increase in the dry matter content per unit weight following sample dehydration and during the smoking process (da Silva, 2002). These results agreed with the work of Omojowo <i>et al.</i> (2008); Omojowo <i>et al.</i> (2009) and da Silva <i>et al.</i> (2008).- <b>author simply don't write the results discussed with other study that time author should include the values of other studies</b></p> <p>11.The result of the nutritional composition shows that the higher moisture content, the lower the value of other nutritional components, while the lower the moisture content, the higher the values of other nutritional components. Earlier reports by Daramola <i>et al.</i> (2007 are in agreement with findings in this study.- check and rewrite</p> <p><b>12.</b> Author did any quality indicator study during the storage period? If no means why should include the volatile nitrogen discussion?</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Normally people always follow the Bleeding and gutting procedures for dried, smoked and freshly processed fishes. Then why you select this for the study? If in Nigeria some people did not doing the procedure before processing means author need to explain this in Introduction section.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The aim of the study is good and informative. I mentioned some correction throughout the manuscript. If the author understating the question and change the manuscript then paper will be a good one.	