

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_114038
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Different Ages on The Reproductive Performances of Clarias gariepinus
Type of the Article	

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>All modifications are contained within the manuscript. Commitment to comments and modifications within the manuscript.</p> <p>The title of manuscript has been changed to (Effect of different ages of African catfish (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>) broodstock on reproductive performance and fries production).</p> <p>The number of fish is insufficient to judge the effect of age. There is no method for rearing and feeding of larvae up to 10 days old in materials and methods. The method for measuring water quality is not described in materials and methods.</p> <p>Why were the volume of semen, weight of eggs, and diameter of eggs stripped from the broodstock not estimated with a difference in age, and why were the abnormal larvae, length and weight of the resulting larvae not estimated with the age of the broodstock.</p> <p>There are interpretations in the discussion that are not supported by results within the manuscript. The discussion is not good.</p> <p>There are references in the text that are not in the reference list.</p> <p>There are unintelligible sentences. There are paragraphs that need to be rephrased.</p> <p>In general, the research idea is good, but the implementation of the idea is not good.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are unintelligible sentences. There are paragraphs that need to be rephrased.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Commitment to comments and modifications within the manuscript.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamed Hamed El-Sayed Saleh
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Egypt