



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

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The topic is relevant since the alternative feed components not competing with human foods are required to be broadened. No question on the importance of rabbit production in developing countries, and it is also favourable in other part of the World. However, the introduction is very long and contains a lot of unnecessary parts and discussion. It has to shorten to maximum of 2 pages. The intro should focus on the scope of the trial, it gives the background for it and the too much of details make the reader lost. On the other hand there is no discussion on processing of forage, therefore it is not clear why fresh and wilted A. Africana was studied. I suggest the following title: Dietary influences of Aspilina Africana on litter traits of breeding rabbit does, considering that no physiological variables are studied in the trial. The keywords should change: Aspilina Africana, rabbit does, litter traits, forage process It is also not clear when the study started: at insemination or at parturition? If the treatments were not statistically significant ($P < 0.05$), please, do not discuss the difference; and consider them as the similar. In material and methods the mixed forage has to be specified: what was the ratio of components? Please, give the nutrient content of the feeds (concentrate and forages) as well (preferably analytical data if it is not available than calculated data). In results and discussion section: only the significant differences ($P < 0.05$) should be discussed as treatment effect. What was the feed intake? Make a discussion on the wilted vs. fresh A. Africana. Table 2: unit of litter size is not gram. The mortality data seem strange: if the average litter size was 5.6 and 5.2 in T1 and T2, respectively and the litter size at weaning was 3.7 and 4.6, than it takes 34% and 12% loss during the lactation. Table 3: I suppose it is not weight gain but litter weigh at different time. What was the health status of T1 rabbits? Some of the cited references did not support the results from the present trial, therefore it is	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	suggested to omit them. Use recent references (the example of a performance from the 1932 publication is not acceptable in 2013). The conclusion should be focused on the present results and not discussing on general issues. The real conclusion from this study is: Either fresh or wilted <i>A. africana</i> improved the litter performance in rabbits. Therefore <i>A. africana</i> is favourable in rabbit does feeding and the nutritive value of it is better than the ... used a control.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The precise location is not necessary (page 6, line 170-172)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The set up of the experiment has to be clearly described in the paper. The “introduction” and the “results and discussion” sections have to focus on the scope of the trial. Only statistically reliable differences should be considered as treatment effect and the discussion should be formulate accordingly with more recent references. Make discussion on the wilted vs. fresh forage.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer