



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5933
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSIOLOGICAL INFLUENCES OF <i>Aspilia africana</i> ON LITTER TRAITS OF BREEDING RABBIT DOES
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	used in the feeding trial 3. Result and Discussions • Could litter size be measured in terms of grams (see table 2). Please define litter size • Please qualify litter size(g) at weaning. Is that intended to express survival rate (%mortality) to an age of weaning? • Could the performance in litter size be attributed to the treatments studied (T₁, T₂ and T₃), since the treatments were allocated to the experimental animals after parturition? • Please re-visit method of calculating mortality (pre-weaning mortality of Table 2) • Litter weight need to be qualified. Is it mean or total weight of all the individuals that belong to a single birth? • The Weekly body weight gain(Table3) need to be checked since there is an indication that weekly gain of T₁ groups was 5 and 7 grams during week 2 and 4 respectively whereas it was 108 grams in week 3.	Litter size is not measured in grams (Table 2). It was a typographic error. Litter size has been defined. YES. Although the treatments were allocated after parturition, it is believed that the high nutritive of <i>Aspilia Africana</i> as reported in the manuscript as well as its role as lactation stimulant as reported by [16] enhanced milk production in the does which resulted in better performance of litters in the treated groups (T₂ and T₃). Also, [20] reported that breeder could influence litter size and weight at weaning by the food provided for the nursing doe
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The Abstract need to be adjusted in accordance to the compulsory revision comments. • Some of the work referred are very old(1932, 1980, 1982, 1984 etc) • It is needless to provide detailed scientific justification and/or interpretation for results that show numerical differences only without showing statistically significant differences • Additional statements on the method of statistical analysis required in the materials and methods section. •	The Abstract has been adjusted accordingly. Old references have been removed except very few relevant ones. Corrections effected. Corrections effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• The manuscript require edition in terms of language somewhat • It is better to include data on feed consumption and both biological and economic efficiencies to qualify the claimed reduction in feed cost brought by treatment 2 and 3 in the conclusion section	Corrections effected. Corrections effected.