SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2013_AJEA_3176**
Title of the Manuscript:	**NEEM *(Azadirachta indica)* SEED CAKE/KERNEL AS PROTEIN SOURCE IN RUMINANTS FEED**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Suggestion: The introduction could be summarized and the usual protein supplement (GNC and CSC) could be discussed since the main point of this review is to show the neem cake capacity as protein supplement in relation to the others. Also, no information about *A. indica* was cited in the introduction. In my view, before this manuscript can be considered, a major rewrite is needed to reduce repetitions and have a focus on the beneficial impact of neem diet. It is recommended to have the manuscript proof read by a native English speaker with competency in scientific writing.	A brief information about GNC and CNC; and A. *indica* has been added to the introduction.
Minor REVISION comments	Authors have to decide if they will use the full name or the abbreviation and make it homogeneous in the text. Do you believe that it's interesting to remove the bioactives or just debitterizing the cake? Authors comment about the biological active: against what? There are a lot of recent articles about the antiparasitic effect of *A. indica* (ticks, gastrointestinal nematodes). No comments about it were done. I believe that *A. indica* is more promising as a nutrient than as antiparasitic which justifies the bioactive removal, but I didn't see this information/discussion in the review.	The correction effected has taken note of the bioactives in 2.3 Methods of Processing and Removal of the Active Principles of Neem Seed Cake.
Optional/General comments	Most of the references are concentrated in the 80' 90's decades: we have about 1 reference in 60's, 13 in 70's, 20 in 80's, 18 in 90's, 9 between 2001-2005, 4 between 2006-2010 and 3 between 2011 and 2012. So I believe that it's important to check recent publications to make the review more updated.	The correction effected has taken care by updating with some recent references. There is general correction of the English. Most the corrections are highlighted.