



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_AJEA_5976
Title of the Manuscript:	Haematological Indices and Serum Biochemical Profile of Dwarf Goats Fed Elephant Grass and Vary Levels of Combined Plantain with Mango Peels.
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 (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		I am satisfied with the reviewer's comment most especially the results and discussions. Errors pointed out by the reviewers indicate that they are really an expert in the field of animal science.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		I agree with the comment and observation made in abstract and introduction which i have already corrected. The reviewed paper will testify this when going through.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- There should be no full stop at the end of the titles including tables - The placement of the P-values is inconsistent throughout the write up - The <u>abstract</u> needs some revision especially the conclusion <u>Introduction</u> Lines 32, 34, 40 needs revision	Everything has been corrected by me as pointed out in the abstract and introduction with P-values that was inconsistent before. Materials and method including conclusion with references where also corrected following by the instruction and comments of the reviewers. From , Okoruwa M.I Dept. Animal Science, AAU, Ekpoma.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<u>Materials and Methods</u> Line 84- small sizes are not scientific. The measurement in gramme or cm or mm should be specified. Line 85- which processing centre- factory or what. Is it a commercial centre or a convergence of local processors Line 86- drying under shade- for how many days and what was the moisture content of the end product? Line 89- feeding regime should be under experimental animals and management not under diet formulation Line 91-95 the sentence should be rephrased Line 103- the duration of adaptation period be specified Line 105- were the animals fed only once Line 111- after the needlesgirage should be in tracket Line 125- AOAC has an updated version Line 127- is it one-way or two-way ANOVA? Table 3: Values of Final RBC are not correctly compared. The superscripts are not placed correctly. Line 167 needs rephrasing Line 186- 187 should be rewritten Line 227- should be rewritten treatment	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should be deleted Line 233- the P value should be inserted Lines 245- 247- P values should be included Line 259- should be rephrased Line 281- should be rephrased Line 296- should be rephrased Line 298- should be rephrased	
--	---	--