



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_49092
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SAGO EFFLUENT ON THE LEVELS OF THE GROWTH HORMONE IN THE BLOOD SAMPLE OF THE FRESH WATER FISH CLARIAS BATRACHUS
Type of the Article	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	<p>Please change your title to "Effect of sago effluent on growth hormone levels in <i>clarias batrachus</i> blood sample"</p> <p>But wherein the authors add the physical observed attributes of the fish as recommended, then the title becomes "Effect of sago effluent on growth hormone levels in <i>In claria batrachus</i> fresh water fish"</p>	<p>I accept the change in the title as recommended.</p> <p>Effect of Sago effluent on the growth hormone levels in <i>Clarias batrachus</i> blood sample.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 8: was it significantly high, low or different? line 15: recast line 48: recast.</p> <p>Introduction was nicely written. had the technical flow and scientific background for the research LINE 58/63: add reference line 59: phrase is unscientific. Use a better word SEPARATE all numbers from their measuring units or concentration. Line 76: title is too long. plz shorten line 102: plz correct</p> <p>line 12: Also add fish to your keywords</p> <p>Also provide the GPS location of where you collected the fish and the sago effluent.</p> <p>The experimental design is faulted. If the only analyses carried out was growth hormone, then a physical observation must have accompanied the research like weight, height, fin size and head size or sizes of internal organs etc. as evidence for the physical attributes. Those would provide data for discussion and add progress to research. Plz can you add them?</p> <p>Conclusion needs to be improved. conclusion is only summary of your key findings. you do not refer someone else's work in conclusion.</p>	<p>All the recommended corrections were made.</p> <p>Along with growth hormones levels other studies like physiological, histological studies were done and already been published.</p> <p>Conclusion has been improved.</p>
Optional/General comments		

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)	No ethical issues