



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_47647
Title of the Manuscript:	SOLID STATE FERMENTATION OF PLANT PROTEIN MEALS USING <i>Lactobacillus acidophilus</i> FOR IMPROVING FEED VALUE
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Table 1 and Table 2 need to be reviewed (suggest to display as shown in Table 3 and 4), so that it will be easier to discuss. The discussion section was over elaborated because the tables were not displayed accordingly. The statistical analysis related to the LSD (Least Square Difference) was not shown properly. There should be more information related to LSD should be shown in the results such as critical values and so on. The results and data tabled showed that this concept was not clearly understood. P> 0.05 in the discussion and P< 0.05 were both used showed that the statistical concept was not understood. 	If the critical values for the LSD calculations are included the work may look cumbersome due to the many parameters. However the values are all available but in most published works the FLSD.05 are simply displayed. I have corrected the P values. I appreciate your concern about Table 1 and table 2 . These tables are different from table 3 and 4. In my work I stated as follows... The mean values of the proximate analysis from the three plant protein meals were subjected to one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Pair wise independent t test was carried out to examine significant differences between the proximate analyses of fermented and non fermented variants of each plant protein meal.// The table1 and 2 were analysed using ANOVA and tables 3 and 4 were analysed using pairwise t test. So the presentation cannot be the same based on these facts.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The units used in the manuscript were not consistent and did not follow the SI Unit (h, min) Spelling Mueller Hinton Broth (Instead of molarhinton broth) Spelling Copper instead of cupper 	Corrected all
Optional/General comments	<p>Some spelling mistakes and some related small/capital letters in the manuscript (line 194, 211,221, 256, and so on)</p> <p>The contents were good but the statistical analysis was not done properly.</p>	Spellings are checked and corrected too.

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	