



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4617
Title of the Manuscript:	UTILIZATION OF NOODLE WASTE AS REPLACEMENT FOR MAIZE IN THE DIET OF BROILER STARTER CHICKEN
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 7 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture 2013_AJEA_4617 UTILIZATION OF NOODLE WASTE AS REPLACEMENT FOR MAIZE IN THE DIET OF BROILER STARTER CHICKEN Research paper The main objective of this study was to determine the effect of partial or whole replacement of maize with NW on growth characteristics, cost benefits, and blood parameters of broiler chicken (as part of the starter diet). In general, the topic of this manuscript and described research are relevant to current trends to increase the performance and growth efficiency of broiler chicken and to utilize more accessible sources to be used in their diets. However, please revised the manuscript and correct all grammar mistakes. Also, additional basic information is needed and several concerns need to be addressed: 1. Abstract: • Lines 22-23: Significant but $p > 0.05$? please correct/explain. • It is important to mention the significance and relevance of the current study. 2. Introduction:	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In general, this section is very short and not informative. Additional information should be added as for what is known and done when it comes to how different sources of carbohydrates/protein might affect the growth and performance of broiler chicken. Please include more information about the rationale behind the current study design and the choice/relevance of the tested noodle waste. Also, please further explain what exactly was the noodle waste used ? from what source ? what was the mineral content (specifically iron, as Hb was measured). Other specific comments: • Line 38: Reference is missing • Line 39: Showed should be shown. • Line 43: Reference is missing. • Line 47: Please define noodle waste, why is it a good source of energy ? 3. Material and methods: This section is very poorly written and therefore hard to follow and understand. I suggest to divide this section into several sub sections: 1. Animals, diet, study design. 2. Blood parameters...etc...in addition, basic information is missing: • Line 59: Please clarify the source of the broilers used. Was the supplier a local farmer? Research facility? Commercial hatchery ? • Line 60: The duration of the study ? • Was the study protocol approved by the research institution animal welfare committee? • Was the study conducted in	The introduction has been revised and beefed up The justification/rationale has been stated in the introduction. it is included as a cheap alternative source of energy compared to maize. The iron content has been included The reference has been included. Noodle waste has been defined as a by-product from food processing company that produces indomie noodle being eaten by populace as source of energy The methodology has been divided into sub-section The source of broiler is from local hatchery in Ibadan The duration for the feeding trial was 4 weeks. The research is approved by relevant committee on animal welfare
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	temperature, humidity, light controlled rooms ? provide details. • Line 63: Birds were allocated into treatment groups based on what ? BW? Hb? • Line 66: What does it mean “hematological and serum biochemical indices” ? please provide explanation about what was measured and how. • Line 72: See previous comment. • Line 73: How many birds were selected and based on what ? • Line 76: How much heparin? • In general, provide methodologies and all kits names that were used and for all analyses. • Statistical analysis: Not clear at all. 4. Results and discussion - In general, this section is not detailed enough. Authors mention differences between treatments, but more specifics are required. Also, since the authors chose to combine the results section with the discussion, this needs further discussion of the significance of the results provided here and in light of the literature. Specific comments: • Lines 104-106: Not clear. • Line 109: Poorly utilize ? explain. • Line 111: Performance in terms of what ? BW ? What about the broilers energetic status (i.e. liver glycogen)? • Lines 115-116: Please add further discussion. • Line 118: What does it mean “Health status” ?	The allocation was based on body weighth Haematological indices are, Hb, PCV, RBC,WBC. Etc While serum biochemical indices include, blood Total protein, albumin, globulin etc The statistical analysis was done using software SAS Statistical Analysis System SAS Stat. Version 9 It has been revised This section has also been revised Health status based on haematological and serum biochemical indices
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Lines 124-126: Poorly written, not clear. • Line 129: Not clear, how were these factors measured ? • Lines 136-139: Further discussion is required. Also, reference is missing. • Lines 140-151: Not clear. Please revise.	Noted The section has been revised.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		