SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Annual Research & Review in Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_50359**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Dried Pig Faeces: Impacts on Growth, Haematology and Histology of Clarias gariepinus**
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

	Reviewer's comment Reference your article entitled "Dried Pig Faeces: Impacts on Growth, Haematology and Histology of Clarias gariepinus" Author is suggested to incorporate the following recommended modifications in paper and resubmit for further evaluation. My decision is based on the following reasons:	**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	**Abstract** **Comment 1:** The period (number of days) in which the research work was conducted should be included in the abstract and in materials and method. **Materials and method** **Comment 2:** Mention the total time duration of research work with specific months and year in the start of "Materials and Methods". please state the category of the fish whether fingerlings, juveniles or sub-adult **comment 3:** What method did you use in formulating your feed? Comment 4:Add the component on growth parameters as being mentioned in your abstract **Comment 5:** Discussion is missing. Write it within two pages as: ✓ In the beginning, discuss your own results in 2 -3 lines only. ✓ Afterwards, co-relate the findings of current study with at least 5 recent previous publications either in support or in contradiction for justification of results. ✓ Finally, provide future recommendations or implications (two to three lines) of research in its last portion. **Comment 6:** Conclusion is missing as well in this file. Please do provide core outcome of the research in at least 4 to 5 lines. Improve the write up as well. **Comment 6:** According to the journal format reference must be cited or accepted in super script digits only. ➢ At the end of sentence or paragraph before punctuation or fullstop[1]. ➢ In case of two or more references, separate the superscript digits by comma[1,2,3]. ➢ If there is more references but in continuous sequence then use (-) desh between super script digits [4-8]. ➢ Reference must be cited in the text in an ascending order, which should be following by reference list. This sequence must be consistent throughout the manuscript from introduction till the discussion portion. Don't cite references randomly. ➢ Add some current references and exclude the old dated back references because such references are only acceptable in determination of parameter. ➢ Provide the DOI or URL of each reference in the reference list	

Minor REVISION comments	So water quality check was not included?	
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)*	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Edem, Edem Thomas***
Department, University & Country	***University Of Calabar, Nigeria***