



achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

[biodiv] New notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

1 pesan

Anisa Septiasari <smujo.id@gmail.com>

8 Maret 2020 16.14

Balas Ke: Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

You have been added to a discussion titled "Submission" regarding the submission "Effect of The Probiotic Bacillus NP5 on Water Quality, Growth Performance, and Disease Resistance in the Rearing Media of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

Link: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5565>

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)



achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

[biodiv] Editor Decision

2 pesan

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com>

25 April 2020 07.04

Balas Ke: Smujo Editors <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>, Mas bayu Syamsunarno <masbyu@gmail.com>, Widia Ningrum <ningrumwidia01@gmail.com>, Jumyanah Jumyanah <yana073@gmail.com>, Mustahal Mustahal <mustahal13@gmail.com>

Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra, Mas bayu Syamsunarno, Widia Ningrum, Jumyanah Jumyanah, Mustahal Mustahal:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, "Effect of The Probiotic Bacillus NP5 on Water Quality, Growth Performance, and Disease Resistance in the Rearing Media of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

 Reviewer A:

1. The title should be modified to make it more clear to the reader. The author should decide whether the main highlight in this research is water quality in the media or growth performance of the African catfish.
2. Abstract should be no more than 200 words
3. In the line 33-36, the sentence "*In an intensive culture systems, fish are reared in high density, thereby requiring high amounts of feed which eventually stress it up (Cerezuela et al. 2012, Giri et al. 2014) and many accumulation of organic matter originating from leftover feed and feces (Ren et al. 2019)*" should be rearranged to make it more easy to understand.
4. Change the word "deposited" in the line 38 into "excreted".
5. Change the sentence in the line 39 from "*The presence of ammonia in water furthermore makes fish susceptible to bacterial infection.....*" into "*The presence of ammonia in water further increase fish's susceptibility to bacterial infection.....*".
6. The methodology of disease challenge should be elaborated more clearly, Table 2 should give more explanation and information since disease challenge was conducted between 30-45 days of rearing. The data about disease challenge should presented separately to avoid confusion.
7. Feeding programs in this research should be more thoroughly explained. especially since feed intake of the control treatment was higher compared to other treatments. It is also should be noted that the FCR of control treatment was noticeably higher compared to common African catfish culture practice. Furthermore, it can be seen in the 30-45 days that feed intake of the control treatment was the highest among others although the initial biomass of the control treatments was significantly lower. Thus, I wonder whether control treatment was overfed compared to other treatments.
8. It is possible that higher ammonia level in the control treatment was mainly caused by overfed/ accumulation of uneaten feed in the bottom of the tanks? Especially since the value of FCR of the control treatment was amusingly higher compared to other treatment.
9. It is true that some probiotics can enhance water quality parameters through nitrification and denitrification bacteria, however in this research, only ammonia was measured, no data available on nitrite and nitrate. Thus the author should explain how this ammonia data can be linked to whole process of nitrification and denitrification dynamics in the cultured media.
10. While it is true that enhance of water quality can improve feed conversion rate value, the statement in the line 296-297 "*This means that the use of feed in treatment A was better, since it reduced the amount of feed not digested by the fish*" should be further elaborated. I am not sure that probiotics treatment can affect digestibility value of the feed.
11. In the line 310-311, the word "*suppressing*" should be revised into "*converting*"

12. In the line 313-315, in the research conducted by Putra and Romdhonah (2019) the probiotics are supplemented in the diets while in this research the probiotics were applied into the water media. It would be misleading to compared this research directly due to different application method. Thus, statement in the manuscript that claim highlight the correlation between of prebiotic that applied on the rearing media with the enhancement of gut properties might be far stretched or need more thorough explanation.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer G:

In this present article entitled "Effect of The Probiotic *Bacillus* NP5 on Water Quality, Growth Performance, and Disease Resistance in the Rearing Media of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)", authors have described the potential of probiotics candidate in aquaculture. However, I have few questions and suggestions.

1. Previously, several reports have been published regarding the probiotics in aquaculture. So, what is the novelty of this present investigation? It needs solid justification.
2. Scientific name must be in italics (line No. 18)
3. 'Disease resistant' word should be added in the keyword.
4. Line No. 71: Convert the rpm to 'g'. Does 1000 rpm is enough to settle down the bacteria?
5. What is the strength and pH of the phosphate buffer saline?
6. Do the pathogenic bacteria take from mid log phase? Line no. 92: check the spelling of bacteria.
7. 'injected into catfish intramuscularly'. Why not oral feeding or interperitoneal injection? It is better way to accelerate disease pathology.
8. Introduction is not compact and needs upgradation. The current scenario of aquaculture production and its loss due to bacterial disease should be addressed.
9. Line No. 95: 'bacteria was' should be changed to 'bacteria were' or 'bacterium was'.
10. Authors have taken temperature as a parameter. What is the relation between temperature and probiotics?
11. Line No. 132: 'blood picture parameters' is not soothing good.
12. Histology was carried out with gill, liver and kidney. However, oral route is the main entry point of pathogen in natural condition. Furthermore, in most of the cases, gut is considered as the first site of attachment for both pathogens and probiotics. So, hislogy of gut might be considered.
13. Stress parameters are very important in pathology experiment. So, it is better to evaluate the level of MDA, CAT and SOD, and make a clear relationship between them [follow the article Nandi et al 2018 Probiotics and Antimicrobial Proteins 10:391=398].
14. Line No.148: 'Duncan multiple test range' needs citation. [Duncan DB(1955) Multiple range and multiple F-tests. Biometrics 11:1-42]
15. Read these articles and make the discussion more compact. [(a) Wanka, et al. 2018. *BMC microbiology*, 18(1), 119. (b) Nandi et al 2017 *Aquaculture Research*. 48: 4334-4345. (c). Hoseinifar SH, et al. 2018, *Frontiers in microbiology* 9 (2018): 2429. (d). Tarnecki, A. M., et al. 2019 *Scientific reports*, 9(1), 1-11. (e) Feliatra, F., et al. 2018. *F1000Research*, 7. (f) Vieco-Saiz, N., et al, 2019. *Frontiers in microbiology*, 10, 57. (g) Banerjee et al, 2016, *Archives of Microbiology*. 199: 115-124
16. The discussion section needs more compactness. The mode of action of probiotics and how it confers benefits to host should be addressed.
17. Histology Figures are in black and white and thus not good for review.
18. Authors have given a combined "result and discussion" section and a separate discussion section. Can't understand. It should be combined or two separate sections.
19. The formatting of references is not uniform. Please check it carefully.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer J:

I appreciate your research, however it needs to be carefully reviewed before publishing:

Some abbreviations were not defined at their first mention. For example: *A. hydrophila* (line 17), SGR (line 21), WSSV (line 63)

"African catfish" in the keyword section (line 25) should be "*Clarias gariepinus*", "**key words**" should be "**keywords**"

The unit "**rpm**" should be change as "**g or rcf**". Rpm (revolutions per minute) is not as useful a unit, because the force varies with the radius of your machine (the bigger the radius, the more acceleration is applied to your samples for the same rpm).

Should remove treatments "(control, A: *Bacillus* NP5 of 1×10^9 CFU/mL, and B: *Bacillus* NP5 of 1×10^{10} CFU/mL)" from legend of tables because they were described in the Method section.

Should use the same number of digits after comma for all values in the table 1

I do not understand why the title paper wrote about *Clarias gariepinus* but the Figures showed images of another species (*Clarias* sp.).

Taxa of bacteria should be italicized. For example: line 17, 360

The manuscript has many errors in English. The manuscript should be checked carefully by a native speaker or an editing service to ensure that the manuscript is free of errors. I will not list all of errors, but will give several examples:

Line 13: "investigate the provision of probiotic *Bacillus* NP5 in rearing media" should be "investigate **the effects** of provision of **the** probiotic *Bacillus* NP5 in rearing media"

Line 17: "pathogenic **bacteria**" should be "pathogenic **bacterium**"

Line 19, line 352: "at the end of rearing period" should be "at the end of **the** rearing period"

Line 20: "**largest**" should be "**highest**"

Line 22, 188: "respectively." should be ", respectively."

Line 34: "In **an** intensive culture **systems**" should be "In intensive culture systems or In an intensive culture system:

Line 43: "Poor water quality directly **influence**" should be "Poor water quality directly **influences**"

Line 53, 68, 69: "**have** been reported" should be "**has** been reported"

Line 58: "probiotic *Bacillus* NP5" should be "**the** probiotic *Bacillus* NP5"

Line 69: "Isolates of probiotic *Bacillus* NP5 were" should be "The probiotic *Bacillus* NP5 was"

Line 70: "isolate of *Bacillus* NP5 **bacteria**" should be "*Bacillus* NP5 **bacterium**"

Line 79: "**prior to**" should be "**before**"

Line 83: "**concentrations of probiotics**" should be "**concentrations of the probiotic**"

Line 92: "**bacteri**" should be "**bacterium**", and "**were**" should be "**was**"

Line 96: "the pathogenic **bacteria** was" should be "the pathogenic **bacterium**"

Line 114: "**were**" should be "**was**"

Line 119: "rearing process" should be "**the** rearing process"

Line 122: "accordance **to**" should be "accordance **with**"

Line 132: "each **treatments**" should be "each **treatment**", and "blood samples taken" should be "blood samples **were** taken"

Line 140: "based on the Wada et al. (2011) method" should be "based on the method described by Wada et al. (2011)"


Line 159: "value of the temperature range" should be "**values** of the temperature range"

Line 174: "3 different dosages of probiotic *Bacillus* NP5" should be "**the** 3 different dosages of **the** probiotic *Bacillus* NP5"

Line 213: "with probiotic" should be "with **the** probiotic"

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

 **C-5565-Article Text-20207-1-4-20200327 reviewed by Indra.doc**
590K

achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

25 April 2020 08.05

Kepada: Smujo Editors <editors@smujo.id>

Cc: Mas bayu Syamsunarno <masbyu@gmail.com>, Widia Ningrum <ningrumwidia01@gmail.com>, Jumyanah Jumyanah <yanah073@gmail.com>, Mustahal Mustahal <mustahal13@gmail.com>

Dear Smujo Editors,

Thank you very much for your email. We are still working on revising the manuscript. We will send it to you as soon as possible.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra.

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

--

Sincerely,

Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra

Department of Fisheries

Faculty of Agriculture, University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Indonesia.

Email: putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id

Mobile: +6281213177455



achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

[biodiv] New notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

1 pesan

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com>

7 Mei 2020 16.09

Balas Ke: Smujo Editors <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

You have been added to a discussion titled "[biodiv]" regarding the submission "Effect of The Probiotic Bacillus NP5 on Water Quality, Growth Performance, and Disease Resistance in the Rearing Media of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

Link: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5565>

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)



achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

[biodiv] New notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

2 pesan

DEWI NUR PRATIWI <smujo.id@gmail.com>

12 Mei 2020 06.59

Balas Ke: DEWI NUR PRATIWI <biodiv07@gmail.com>, Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

You have been added to a discussion titled "Uncorrected proof" regarding the submission "Effect of The Probiotic Bacillus NP5 on Water Quality, Growth Performance, and Disease Resistance in the Rearing Media of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

Link: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5565>

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)**DEWI NUR PRATIWI** <smujo.id@gmail.com>

12 Mei 2020 07.01

Balas Ke: DEWI NUR PRATIWI <biodiv07@gmail.com>, Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

You have been added to a discussion titled "BILLING" regarding the submission "Effect of The Probiotic Bacillus NP5 on Water Quality, Growth Performance, and Disease Resistance in the Rearing Media of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

[biodiv] New notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

1 pesan

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com>

16 Mei 2020 09.48

Balas Ke: Smujo Editors <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: Achmad Noer Khaerin Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

There is new activity in the discussion titled "Uncorrected proof" regarding the submission "Effect of The Probiotic Bacillus NP5 on Water Quality, Growth Performance, and Disease Resistance in the Rearing Media of African Catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

Link: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5565>

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)



achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

[biodiv] Editor Decision

2 pesan

Smujo Editors <smujo.id@gmail.com>

16 Mei 2020 23.34

Balas Ke: Smujo Editors <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: ACHMAD NOERKHAERIN PUTRA <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>, MAS BAYU SYAMSUNARNO <masbyu@gmail.com>, WIDIA NINGRUM <ningrumwidia01@gmail.com>, JUMYANAH <yanah073@gmail.com>, MUSTAHAL <mustahal13@gmail.com>

ACHMAD NOERKHAERIN PUTRA, MAS BAYU SYAMSUNARNO, WIDIA NINGRUM, JUMYANAH, MUSTAHAL:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, "Effect of the administration of probiotic Bacillus NP5 in the rearing media on water quality, growth, and disease resistance of African catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

Our decision is to: Accept Submission

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)**Smujo Editors** <smujo.id@gmail.com>

16 Mei 2020 23.35

Balas Ke: Smujo Editors <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: ACHMAD NOERKHAERIN PUTRA <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>, MAS BAYU SYAMSUNARNO <masbyu@gmail.com>, WIDIA NINGRUM <ningrumwidia01@gmail.com>, JUMYANAH <yanah073@gmail.com>, MUSTAHAL <mustahal13@gmail.com>

ACHMAD NOERKHAERIN PUTRA, MAS BAYU SYAMSUNARNO, WIDIA NINGRUM, JUMYANAH, MUSTAHAL:

The editing of your submission, "Effect of the administration of probiotic Bacillus NP5 in the rearing media on water quality, growth, and disease resistance of African catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)," is complete. We are now sending it to production.

Submission URL: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5565>

Smujo Editors
editors@smujo.id

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



achmad Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

[biodiv] New notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity

1 pesan

DEWI NUR PRATIWI <smujo.id@gmail.com>

18 Mei 2020 09.45

Balas Ke: DEWI NUR PRATIWI <biodiv07@gmail.com>, Ahmad Dwi Setyawan <editors@smujo.id>

Kepada: Achmad Noerkhaerin Putra <putra.achmadnp@untirta.ac.id>

You have a new notification from Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity:

There is new activity in the discussion titled "BILLING" regarding the submission "Effect of the administration of probiotic Bacillus NP5 in the rearing media on water quality, growth, and disease resistance of African catfish (*Clarias gariepinus*)".

Link: <https://smujo.id/biodiv/authorDashboard/submission/5565>

Ahmad Dwi Setyawan

[Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity](#)