



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11958
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Effects of Poultry Production in Edo State, Nigeria
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	Abstract Lines 10: "...were statistically selected...how? be specific Line 15: " nose cover for protection from bad odour..." grammatically wrong. Rephrase Line 21: "by the" is duplicated, delete one and not by the chi square but "by chi square Line 22: Your conclusion is too general...is rural poultry inclusive...? Rephrase the sentence. Introduction Line 40 to 43: It was noted that a layer is estimated.... No reference is cited. Line 44: ... livestock animals...grammatically wrong.. just "livestock" will be ok Line 55 to 58: "It was observed water drops over the....." No reference is cited...provide reference Methodology Line 86:" Proportional sampling technique...."is that a form of a standard sampling procedure for questionnaires..? Line 93: administered on poultry farm workers...grammatically wrong..."administered to" is better. Also Line 95: administered on people living in the vicinity....administered to people Your introduction and methodology did not provide information on estimated commercial poultry population in	This has been changed to randomly select. This has been changed to adopting the use of covering of nose One of the by the is deleted This has been changed to by chi-square This has been rephrased to indicate the recommendation for only commercial poultry sector (Oluyemi and Roberts,2000) has been cited to support line 40-43 Only Livestock is retained in line 44 Potential Environmental Risks, 2008 has been cited to support line 55-58 Proportional sampling technique in line 86 is replaced with random sampling To replaced on in line 93 To replaced on in line 95 The introduction has included information on poultry sector in Edo state as it indicated that the backyard poultry constitutes about 84% of total



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the study area. Refer to (Adene, D. F. and Oguntade, A.E. (2006). FAO Animal Production and Health Division; <i>Poultry Sector Country Review</i>) Result and discussion Line 108:.... “were young adults” is that a form of age category...rephrase Line 116: “Table 1: Socio-economic background of the respondents...” replace with “demographic information of respondents.... Line 118: how did you measure distance between poultry houses and neighbors. It does not reflect on your methodology Line 129...The title of the table is incomplete Line 158: The title of the table does not reflect the data generated and also incomplete. Eg. Distance was not captured in generated data	poultry production, while the exotic contributes about 14% to the total poultry production in Nigeria (Adene and Oguntade, 2006). Young adults has been replaced with adults in line 108 In Line 116, Socio-economic background of the respondents...” has been replaced with “demographic information of respondents It has been indicated in line 118 that the distance was physically measured by the trained enumerators. The title of the table has been corrected in line 129 The title of the table has been adjusted to reflect what has been done as Types of Complaint of Against the Poultry Farms as Indicated by Farm Owners, Workers and Neighbor.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are lots of grammatical issues in the manuscript. The author need to work on it	The grammatical errors have been corrected and table reformatted appropriately
<u>Optional/General</u> comment		