

**Editor's comment :**

final decision on the manuscript 2018/JSRR/41674.

I can anticipate to you that on the whole the ms was satisfactorily revised according the comments of the reviewers but there is still an open question, raised by one reviewer (see file "Feedback\_JSRR\_41674\_v2\_Vee" in the fold "5.Revised\_MS\_v2\_and\_Feedback\_v2), that is: in the revised manuscript the authors do not clearly write the permits obtained to perform this type of study.

Please note that maybe there is an error in the file " 6.Peer review information\_JSRR\_41674". In fact, in this file on the second page, 4th row, 5th column (i.e stage 3), concerning KOKABAS mark 9 is reported as average mark whereas in the file "Rev\_JSRR\_41674\_Meh\_v1 of 25/5" (see fold 4.Re-Review report\_V1) I can read that the same reviewer has assigned 10 for the revised manuscript.

Final evaluation on the manuscript: " ALTERATIONS IN STEROID SEX HORMONES (17 $\beta$  estradiol and testosterone) OF *Clarias gariepinus* EXPOSED TO DIFFERENT SUB-LETHAL CONCENTRATIONS OF CYPERMETHRIN"

On the whole the manuscript has been revised in a satisfactory way according to the comments of the reviewers but there is still an open crucial question, that is: the authors have to indicate the approval (permits) for performing their study on the alterations of steroid sex hormones (17 $\beta$  estradiol and testosterone) in *Clarias gariepinus* exposed to different sub-lethal concentrations of cypermethrin.

**Author's feedback :**

The approval for this research was received from the relevant authorities in my country. This has now been added to the revised manuscript version 3. Please check the revised manuscript under the ethical consideration section (last sentence).