



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>)

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>Abstract</p> <p>1. The abstract is too long. Summarise it. Try to follow the Author's guideline of the journal. Follow this instruction below.</p> <p>The abstract should be concise and informative. It should not exceed 300 words in length. It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, techniques and methods used major findings with important data and conclusions.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It needs minor correction.</p> <p>Try to do numbering of your manuscript before submitting for review.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Well written, very simple, scientific and precise</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mamoud Mansaray</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Sierra Leone</i>