Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJFAR_130052**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Dietary African yam bean meal, Sphenostylis sternocarpa as a complementary substitute for soybean meal in African catfish, Clarias gariepinus fingerlings: effect on intestinal histology and zootechnical performance**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**I think this manuscript is good, and will be provide an important literature for (*Clarias gariepinus*) culture. And will encourage using local underutilized legumes as an alternative to soybean meal in fish feed specially in countries where soybeans are not available. Thus, reducing feed costs.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title of the manuscript suitable, but I suggest that the title should be as follows: Effect of African yam bean meal (*Sphenostylis sternocarpa*) as a complementary substitute for soybean meal on intestinal histology and zootechnical performance of *Clarias gariepinus***	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**The abstract comprehensive, and well- summarized**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**In general the manuscript is well written, the study method appropriate to the research question, and the results clearly presented, and the discussion concise enough and relevant to their results**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The references are sufficient and recent**	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**The English language quality of the article is understandable and suitable for scholarly communication**	
Optional/General comments	**I appreciate the opportunity to review this manuscript. I think it will be a good addition for African catfish, Clarias gariepinus feed industry. I recommend this paper be accepted, after authors have addressed the following comments:** **Methods:** - **In methods section mentioned that the fish weighs during experiment have taken every two weeks, but in abstract and figure1 mentioned that have taken every week, which one is correct?** - **Also in the last sentence of methods section the word temperature must be added after a word water in a sentence (the water was maintained a 27-30 °C).** **Results:** - **In results section, the part of** *Growth parameters and nutrient utilisation of C. gariepinus fed varying replacement level of African yam bean:* in line 7, did authors mean (**T4 and T5**) or (**T5 and T6**)?? **References:** **There are many references were written in the study text but were not listed in the references list. For example: (Olorunyomi et al., 2021, Lim and Webster, 2006, Viveen et al., 2005, Hussein et al., 2012, Blake and Luptasch, 2012, Jain et al., 2019, Luptasch, 2008). Also the reference Abulhamid et al., 2020 and Adelhamid et al., 2020, which one is correct?, the** reference **Osho et al., 2013 or Oso et al., 2013, and the reference Ibrahim et al., has different dates (2017 in the discussion text and 2007 in the reference list).** **So references in the text and references list should be reviewed carefully.**	

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:	**Sana Yagoub Abdallah Tahir**
Department, University & Country	**Alneelain University, Sudan**