



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11412
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth response of quails (<i>Coturnix coturnix japonica</i>) to varying levels of cassava (<i>Manihot esculenta</i>) tuber meal as a replacement for maize (<i>Zea mays</i>)
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	Animal number is low (32). More in-depth discussion is required. Discussion section is not enough to properly explain reasons of the results obtained Where is composition of Cassava tuber meal? Table 1: It should be written Analysis results instead of Calculated analysis. Table 1: Where is explanation of min. premix at the bottom of table 1? The references were not appropriate and the latest was 2004. There are a lot of old references. Into the text there are 13 literature sources used, 0% were published after 2005. Introduction: Haruna et al., 1999: I could not find this reference cited in the reference section.	It is true. But this is because it was not possible to get greater number in any quail farm around. We had to travel to a different geopolitical zone (Sapele) before we could get upto 100 of them. Unfortunately a good number died on transit. We therefore had to use the clinically sound ones (32). Has been provided Has been provided References have been beefed up It is there in reference section



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Introduction: Tewe et al., 1976: The spelling of this author's name differs from that in the reference section. Rakpotobar and Ijiwo (2000): I could not find this reference cited in the reference section. Bamgbose, A., Ogungherro, E., Obasana, M.B., Oteku, L.T., Igene, U.F., Otikhian, C.S.O. and Imasuen, J. A. 2004. WHAT IS ARTICLE NAME??????? Proc. Of 29th annual conf. Of N.S.A.P pp. 219-221. References: Uniformity in references must be seen.	It is Tewe It is 2003 Article name has been provided Ok.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		