

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: March 5, 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: March 13, 2016
Manuscript Title: Effect of dietary lipid level on growth, feed utilization and body composition by Nile perch juveniles (<i>Lates niloticus</i>)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0373/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation).G

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors followed the standard methodology to perform this nutritional study. The procedures were straight forward and the results were properly interpreted and elaborated. Consequently, I have no reservation on the publication of this ms except a few minor suggestions to be considered for revision:

1. In Abstract, no significant level needs to be indicated.

2. Since the significant level (0.05) used was already set in M&M, no need to repeat afterwards.

However, it should be noted that significant difference use $p \leq 0.05$ (small and italic p less than and equal to 0.05) and no significant difference use $p > 0.05$.

3. Rewrite the first paragraph on page 8 as the following: PER in 9% and 11% lipid diet was higher than PER in 15% lipid diet. However, there was no difference in PER among 9%, 11% and 13% lipid diet and also between 13% and 15% lipid diet. (You cannot say that PER was highest in 11% lipid diet when statistical test has clearly claimed no difference among 9%, 11% and 13%, which share a common superscript a).

4. In the last paragraph on page 8, you need to add some explanation how the optimum dietary lipid was estimated. Or, you can state the method in M&M. Something like ‘the optimum required was estimated by taking the first derivative on the polynomial regression model with respect to X then obtaining the solution for X...’

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

(none)