



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_52548
Title of the Manuscript:	Dietary Effects of Almond (<i>Prunus Amygdalus Dulcis</i>) Seed Powder on the Reproductive Indices in Male African Catfish (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>) Broodstock
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	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Your work is very important and valuable, however, to be recognized and cited as a good scientific article, needs to improve a lot, in many ways. In this sense, I collaborate with some recommendations:</p> <p>Line 3: Review nomenclature (<i>Prunus amygdalus dulcis</i>)</p> <p>Lines 3-4: Put the initials of each word lowercase (except the genera of each species).</p> <p>Lines 6-22: Is italics in the abstract a norm of the journal?</p> <p>Line 7: The species name may come in parentheses.No sense in setting the mean body weight in this part of the abstract - Remove!</p> <p>Line 9: Couldn't it be just 0g, 10g ...? Have to put the '/ kg'?</p> <p>Line 22: Fish seeds production??? Seeds is eggs?</p> <p>Line 23: These two keywords are already in the title. Opt for others.</p> <p>Lines 30-35: There are many points in this paragraph, it is truncated.</p> <p>New paragraph (new line 46): Importance of reproduction?</p> <p>Lines 48-50: Reference?</p> <p>Lines 50-51: Truncated.</p> <p>Materials and methods: here are a lot of subtopics, you could put together some like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Experimental site 2 - Collection and acclimation of experimental fish 3 - Formulation of experimental diets ('Proximate composition of experimental diets' does not have to be a subtopic, just adds the information in 'Formulation of experimental diets') 4- Experimental set-up (here you can see the image I talked about in 'image 1') 5 - Evaluation of milt quality (add 'milt volume'; 'Motility duration'; 'Percentage motility'; 'Spermatozoa concentration', because these are items that allow you to evaluate milt quality) 6 - Stripping, egg fertilization and incubation of egg 7 - Determination of fertilization, hatchability and Gonado-somatic index 8 - Histological examination of tests 9 - Statistical analysis <p>It may be possible to further reduce the number of subtopics. Review this!</p> <p>Line 71: oil and vitamin</p> <p>Plate 1: First, this is not a plate (plates are usually drawings, so this is a image and if it is</p>	



not yours, it should be with reference). However, more important to show *P.amygdalus dulcis* seed images would provide an outline of the procedures, illustrations of tanks and how many fish were in each, pointing the quantities of powder added to each tank, finally, it would be more informative that this mere image of seeds.

Line 81: On the table is just vitamin premix.

Why the asterisks?

Line 86: Put same font size as other items

Line 88-89: Describe it better.

Lines 123-126: The reason for this was unclear. To get eggs? If yes, link with item 'Stripping, egg fertilization and incubation of egg'.

Lines 127-129: Either add this information at the beginning, or remove, it because it is out of place here.

Line 136: colon

Line 147: Incomplete information

Lines 171-176: This is discussion

Line 183: Figures

Table 2: It is interesting to note that individuals fed 5 g of powder increased more in weight ...

The initial average weight minus the final average was as follows: D1 = 187; **D2 = 197**; D3 = 122; D4 = 152; D5 = 182

Line 186: I don't understand it. Figures? Is not about data in the table 2?

Lines 196-197: Well, for starters, these are figures.

But the caption and organization of the figure can improve. Join the 5 figures in a single and identify each with letters in the upper right corner. In the legend put: Figure 2: Effects of dietary supplementation of almond seed powder on the histology of the testes of *C. gariepinus*. (A) A transverse section through the testes of *C. gariepinus* fed D1 (Control) (0 mg/kg feed of *P. amygdalus dulcis*), arrows showing many seminiferous tubular sections that are scanty and devoid of spermatozoa. There are no visible lesions seen. Magnification $\times 100$; (B) A transverse section through the testes of *C. gariepinus* fed diet D2 (5g/kg feed of *P. amygdalus dulcis*), arrows showing a few seminiferous sections that have scanty spermatozoa. There are no visible lesions seen. Magnification $\times 100$; (C) A transverse section through the testes of *C. gariepinus* fed diet D3 (10g/kg feed of *P. amygdalus dulcis*), black arrows showing some seminiferous sections that are not fully distended with spermatozoa while red arrows are showing area fully distended with spermatozoa. There are no visible lesions seen. Magnification $\times 100$; (D) A transverse section through the testes of *C. gariepinus* fed diet D4 (15g/kg feed of *P. amygdalus dulcis*), arrows showing organized lobules with no visible lesions but the spermatocytes are not optimally full within the seminiferous lumen. Magnification $\times 100$; (E) A transverse section through the testes of *C. gariepinus* fed diet D5 (20g/kg feed of *P. amygdalus dulcis*), arrows showing densely filled lumen and a well differentiated seminiferous tubule with ripe spermatozoa ready to be released through the sperm duct. Magnification $\times 100$.

Line 222: ($p < 0.05$) \rightarrow This is a result. Remove.

Line 226-230: Reference?

New paragraph (new line 231): Are there any other studies done with this plant? Was it



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>used to test other benefits? Or even reproduction in other organisms? Give more details, a theoretical framework about the object of study.</p> <p>Lines 231-235: But what led to the rise in testosterone? The information needs to be clear to the reader.</p> <p>Lines 247-249: This is obvious. Reword the sentence or delete.</p> <p>Line 275: Just 'Conclusion'</p> <p>References: References do not have same font size</p> <p>You have 26 references in total, to support your entire article. Your introduction and discussion may be richer, and consequently there will be more references here</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lorrane Gabrielle Cantanhede
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Psará, Brazil