



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4636
Title of the Manuscript:	NOODLE WASTE AS REPLACEMENT FOR MAIZE IN THE DIET OF COCKEREL FINISHER CHICKEN
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

[\(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\)](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	Abstract- It is advisable that the abstract be rewritten bearing in mind the follow: ✓ Avoid unnecessary repetition- for instance lines 14 - 16 state parameters that were measured, same parameters were restated in lines 20-23. This is not neat enough, it suggests that author was short of expression and trying to make up for the volume... ✓ Pluralize chicken- chickens ✓ Include the result of dressing percentage- it was indicated but no mentioning in the result Key word- remove PCV as keyword- it is not the only blood parameter that was measured and its value is not even significantly affected. Introduction ✓ The study tends toward a regional importance rather than of main interest to many readers ✓ Line 44 and 45- "Noodle waste is one of the sources of energy in diet of livestock.." – Has noodle waste been accepted/ proved as a source of energy in animal feed or a proposition? ✓ Line 48- "it concluded that maize could..." – it is not very clear whether the author is referring to literature or making an assertion? Nonetheless, it is	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	inappropriate to draw conclusion when result has not been verified. Materials and Methods ✓ Line 54- insert a comma after “one hundred and fifty” ✓ Line 57- diet should be in plural form ✓ Lines 74-77- unnecessary repetition: EDTA and Heparin perform similar function. Result and Discussion Line 93- what is the probability level of similarity? Line 99-100- does birds have taste bud? Line 105- if feed intake was significantly lower and weigh gained significantly higher in birds in control group, how come will there be similarity in feed conversion ratio across the treatments?. Line 108- “in the diet of cockrel” the word mark red was missing Line 109- “is an indicative”- remove an Line 116- report should be in plural form Line 125- recommended values for what? Line 133- broiler starter- how come? Table 1- row for fixed ingredient was missing; include the value in the table to make the 100% Tables 4, 5 and 6- superscripts are not well defined, missed or misplaced Why is the author interested in the blood analysis of the experimental animal instead of other more relevant parameters such as nutrient digestibility? There was no indication of phytotoxin or antinutritional factor in the test ingredient to warrant blood test. It is important that parameter measured have a direct bearing and a link with test sample, not just to collect data!	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Title: - not definite, too broad compared to parameters measured Suggestion: Performance characteristics and economy of using noodle waste as replacement in the diets of cockrel finisher chickens	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr T.O. Akande
Department, University & Country	Department of Animal Nutrition and Biotechnology, Ladoke Akintola University of technology, Nigeria