



## SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Zoology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_48588
Title of the Manuscript:	HISTOMETRY AND GROWTH PERFORMANCE OF AFRICAN CATFISH, Clarias gariepinus, FED PROBIOTICS SUPPLEMENTED DIETS
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>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Nor clear what is the meaning ' values on the same row, having different superscript, are significantly different' in Table 1 and Table 2</li> <li>2) 31.20 ±0.11, unit not shown (page 41)</li> <li>3) Index formula not written properly (better representation , differentiate between symbol X the alphabet and multiplication symbol) – page 41</li> <li>4) Reference Gbadamosi et al (2017) – two reference, should be label as 2017a and 2017b in the entire manuscript</li> <li>5) Page 39 ( The was also significance difference (P&gt;0.05) between T1 and T3 for mucosal fold area, however there was significant difference (P&gt;0.05) between T1, T2, T4, T5 and T6. Both were significant? Should either one be 'not significant' instead?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meaning clarified</li> <li>2. Unit added</li> <li>3. Index separated</li> <li>4. Corrected as a and b</li> <li>5. Result recast and corrected</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Page number – not in order</li> <li>2) Reference format not consistent</li> <li>3) Bruton et al (1979) – not in the article</li> </ol>	Page numbering corrected and Bruton et al (1979) removed, inconsistencies corrected.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good content but the document formatting was not done properly.	

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>