



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_50611
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity Effects of Brown Dried Pawpaw (Carica Papaya) Leaf Extract To Fingerlings Of African Catfish Clarias gariepinus
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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>The purpose of the study should be clearly stated in the introduction section. The plastic bowls were covered with mosquito net to prevent fish from jumping out; there was no aeration, no water change nor feeding throughout the test. (Any references ?)</p> <p>What is the likelihood that the oxygen level throughout the study will affect the results of the study at a fairly critical level (The dissolved oxygen was 4.5mg/l before the commencement of the test and was 4.1mg/l during the test)</p>	<p>The purpose of covering the bowls with mosquito net was to prevent the fish from jumping out of the bowls, since losing fish from the bowl will be recorded as mortality. The essence of not feeding the fish during the study was to reduce waste deposition in bowls to minimize toxicity. Since paw paw contain papain which interfere with the respiration aeration can affect the papain substance present in concentration.</p> <p>The dissolved oxygen was 5.9mg/l before the commencement of the test and was 5.3mg/l during the test. The dissolved oxygen was not at critical level according to Ekubo and Abowei (2011) where they recommended 5.1mg/l as adequate for pond fish culture.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	English and spelling errors should be corrected	Corrected
Optional/General comments	study results seem consistent.	

PART 2:



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There was no ethical issues, since the study was laboratory study