



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6265
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF LOW PROTEIN DIETS SUPPLEMENTED WITH HIGH AMINO ACIDS (METHIONINE AND LYSINE) ON PERFORMANCE OF BROILERS.
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	In the abstract, the author should state clearly the levels of protein he used. To be comprehensive, the author should pay attention to the presentation of the results in the abstracts section.	The levels of protein was stated in abstract More attentions were paid to the result presentation. Table 1 is now under materials and methods for quick access. The energy for diet T2 was actually 2894.77 and not 2694. The NRC reference is poultry not swine. All other corrections are as stipulated.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	For the tables to be self explanatory, the levels of protein should follow T1, T2, T3 and T4. In Table 1. ME (2694.77) for methionine diet T2 should be recalculated. Line 79. Statistical analysis lacks reference. Line 99-100. The poor feed intake may be due basically to high levels of cassava. Line 218. I think this reference is most probably concerning poultry requirement rather than swine.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Title is simplified, clear and reflects most of the contents of the manuscript. The results section is comprehensive and the discussion deals well with literature review.	