SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_10542**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effects of soyabean oil and garlic-in-water supplementation on performance, carcass trait, organs weight, haematology, and serum cholesterol content of broiler chickens**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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** *(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	**In table 1 change "Gross composition" to "Composition". In the second column of this table the total is 102 instead of the correct 100.**	Done Corrected
	It is better to merge tables 1 and 2, to avoid repetitions of data presentation. Also, the composition of the vitamin and mineral premix should be given in the table footnotes. Moreover, if the starter diet was not given to the birds during the experimental period, it should not be shown.	Done Done Noted, thanks, done.
	In tables 3, 4, 5, and 6, some significant differences are reported for soyabean oil (or no), garlic (or no). Unfortunately, the means are not given for these measurements and as a result it is difficult to actually see these differences and understand which was higher or lower. As a result, these tables should be revised to show the values for these data.	Done Noted, thanks, done.
	There is inconsistency between table 4 and conclusions. Abdominal fat deposit is not statistically different in the table, but is reported as different in line 211.	Done
	The same inconsistency also is true for serum cholesterol in table 6 and conclusions in lines 211-212.	Done

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		