Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Zoology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIZ_114044**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Study on The Effects of Different Batches of Stripped Eggs on The Reproductive Performances of Clarias gariepinus**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. Investigating differences for rates of fertilization, hatchability, and survival in captive breeding of the catfish *Clarias gariepinus* (via induced female oviposition), the idea of the manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. In the Abstract: authors can include more information on the background. More information from the literature justifying the study will enrichen their abstract. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Authors show that batches of eggs decrease significantly in rates of fertilization, hatchability, and offspring survival (from the first to the fourth batch). However, they used three females and six males of catfish. I think their sampling sizes are inadequate. The scope of the study is relevant and important to provide information that has potential to guide fish reproduction in captivity, mainly given the importance of catfishes as a contemporary human food resource. However, I think the experimental design is incorrect. 6. References are good.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. English revision will strengthen the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The idea of the study is interesting, and the scope is quite important, given the relevance of catfishes as human food source, as authors already point out. However, I noticed the manuscript was not carefully finished, with the final version not fully done. There are lack of standardization and organization. An English revision would strengthen the paper. Those are points that are fixable. But, even the values of the results do not match between table, results, and summary, which I consider to be very important. Furthermore, if I understood correctly, for the study the authors used nine catfishes, describing as follows. Sperm from six males are combined and all the material diluted together, then separated into 12 sets. Three females are induced to lay eggs four times, also having 12 sets (four batches x three females). Eggs and sperm are mixed in 12 separate tanks. Fertilization, hatching, and fry survival rates are compared. Through variance analysis, there is evidence that rates drop considerably from the first batches to the fourth batches. As I mentioned, the idea is good and the study is important. However, I see limitations in the sampling design that may impact the interpretation of the results, as follows: 1. The number of females used in the system (n = 3) is low, which may represent under-sampling of the real variability in the species, introducing biases in the results. 2. The sperm material also comes from few males (low sample number, n = 6), which may also represent under-sampling of variability, also introducing bias into the results. 3. I miss the discussion also bringing up that stimulating four batches for each female can be	

	stressful and precisely this may be related, at least partially, to the rates decreases. 4. The experiment as described can be considered pseudoreplication. I also made some suggestions directly in the manuscript.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Fábio Perin de Sá**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Estadual Paulista, Brazil**