

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_111873
Title of the Manuscript:	Zootechanical performance and bromatological composition of the flesh of fingerlings of Oreochromis sp (Red Tilapia) fed local feed supplemented with Afrostyrax lepidophyllus seed powder
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the paper showed the effect of Afrostyrax lepidophyllus-supplemented feed to the growth of Tilapia (Oreochromis sp.) 2. Yes, the title is suitable, but I want to improve it, my suggestion is: Zootechnical performance and bromatological composition of the flesh of Oreochromis sp (Red Tilapia) fingerlings fed with local feed supplemented with Afrostyrax lepidophyllus seed powder 3. Yes, should be consistent, the title uses tilapia fingerlings but in the abstract it uses tilapia "fry" 4. Yes 5. I would like to comment on:). However, with supplementation rates of 0.5%, weight gains (61.05±5.82g) were significantly higher compared to other treatments supplemented or not with A.lepidophyllus seed powder in the food. The data showed that it is not only 0.5% which is significantly higher, all fed supplemented with A. lepidophyllus are significantly higher than T0+, and all of those supplemented-feeds are not significantly different from each other. However, with the supplementation rate of 0.5%, the specific growth rate was significantly higher (2.77±0.02%/d) compared to other treatments including the T0- treatment. – The data showed that 0.5% is significantly different only to T0 and not with other treatments as claimed by the author. ...it shows that the zootechnical performances were more relevant with the fish fed with feed supplemented with 0.5% A. lepidophyllus seed powder. The conclusion of the author is misleading because he/she concluded that 0.5% supplemented feed is significant compared with other feeds, however, result showed that all feed supplemented with A. lepidophyllus is significantly different with non-supplemented feeds, and all A. lepidophyllus-supplemented feeds are not significantly different from each other. Meaning any amount or level of A. lepidophyllus from 0.3%-0.5% will give the same level of growth to tilapia fingerlings. 6. Yes. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, it is acceptable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Rhemar C. Bayato
Department, University & Country	Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Philippines