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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**In Abstract**: Aims: the aim of the paper was to??? Moreover there is no difference between title of the paper and aim of it. Study design: does not give any idea of experiment. Place and Duration of Study: add please to the name of University the name of the country: The University of Ibaden in Nigeria. Methodology: I suggest rewrite sentence "Two hundred unsexed, one day old broiler chicks… The Authors divided experiment into two parts, where broiler chicks diet was supplemented by methionine or lysine and in the title in parenthesis is (methionine and lysine) - is it correct? maybe it should be written methionine or lysine?). Moreover it is no explanation that crude protein content of diet was reduced from 24.25 to 10.60%. Therefore it is necessary to write	Corrections effected in the write up all in yellow as stipulated I have effected the change to read methionine OR other corrections are equally effected.All other issues raised by this reviewer had been attended to. Conclusion was reconstructed, although economic aspect was not included in the study,but reduced performance of the broilers mean monetary loss to the farmers.

	that diets from 1 to 4 contained 24.25, 19.7. 15.5 and 10.6 crude protein. Otherwise the reader has to find this information later or skip the reading of paper. Results: please give the full name and then (CP). The same with NRC- it is rule that before we use abbreviation we are obliged to give the full expression. The conclusion is hard to understand. **In Conclusion:** It is difficult to understand the phrase: ….from these studies…. where is the end of sentence? One could expect from Authors to get information what is the optimal supplementation of poultry diet to achieve balance in costs of its production and obtaining the high meat quality. After the reading the full text such expectation is completely wrong. Therefore the conclusion can mislead the reader. The conclusion should be reconsidered. Keywords include one sentence and it does not explain the subject of the paper. **In Introduction:** Line 16-17: what do you mean in expressions: poultry in one form or another…. and fewer religious or social	The NRC cited was actually for poultry not swine. Lines 16-17 to of Introduction was replaced .Check the write up designated in yellow colour.

	taboos ……? Line 46: the cited publication 6 concerns the **Growing and Adult Pigs,** not as it is in the sentence experimental birds??? **In Material and Method's:** Line 60: One hundred and ninety two old broilers? in Abstract in Methodology it is two hundred day old unsexed…What is the right number? Line 64-67: lack of any punctuation! Line 70-71: sacrificed replace by slaughter. Line 71: The eviscerated…. should be: Then eviscerated?? Line 73: Did you weight left or right drumstick and breast muscle because it is not clear when you write : the weight of breast muscle was taken?? **In Results and Discussion:** Line 87: ..are shown in Table 1. Line 89…. had lysine inclusion from 0.50 to 0.80 and methionine on the same level , i.e. 0.25 (In Table 1 missing dot for T2 and methionine level).	

	Line 93: ..while T2 and T3 were similar…it is not true, from Table 2 results that T2 was significantly higher than T3, please check it??? Line 97-99: repetition, please combine what was written in line:92, The feed intake of birds on diets T2,T3 and T4 was similar (2,43kg, 2.38kg and 2.32kg, respectively)…. Line 99: This is not in accordance with results obtained by other authors [(….., please also explain what does it mean NRC: the National Research Council (NRC)??? – in literature 12. council should be Council? The 9th revised edition is concerning poultry not as in cited literature 12 swine. What is correct? **National Research Council. Nutrient Requirements of Poultry:** Ninth Revised Edition, National Academies Press, Washington D.C. 1994. Line 108: along replace by in. Line 113 or 114: it was contrary to or this agrees with number???? It is necessary to put the first author of cited publications: for example, it is on line with data obtained by Al-saffar and Rose [14]…..or contrary to results obtained by Sterrling et al. [2003]. Line 118: adduced, please replace by : mentioned,	

	pointed? explained?, found by …name of author and in line 120: precipitates ill effects …has negative effect by reducing feed intake???? and line 124: assertion replace by statement, assumption??? and in line 123: a toxic effect - …influenced negatively the performance of broilers? Line 124: shift the dot behind the citation. Line 125: …with the report of [18] who reported- the English should be checked and corrected in all the text. It is hard to go ahead the text. Line 129: The digestibility….. needs rewriting and please cite where the results were presented. Line 138-138: the discussion with results of other Authors -23, 24 and 25 should be combined. They obtained the same results but expressions used by Author of the paper : contrary to [23] and then this agrees with [24 and 25] can confuse the reader. Line 150: the breast weight reaches a plateau in response???/ Is it mean that - the application of different levels of methionine in diets, where CP was reduced from 24.25 to 10.60%, had no influence on breast muscle and drumstick weight? Line 155: this result: whose? it is not clear, maybe you	

	should add: from data presented in Table 2 results that??? Line 157: it is in variance ??? Line 159: sentence is without dot. The following text is written by very poor, not acceptable English. **In Conclusion:** Line 166: there is no any evidence in paper data about monetary losses?	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	**In Reference:** 1. What is the name of paper, or name of publisher and place of addition? 2. lack of dot after U. and J. 3. as above: …study. Nig. Poultry J. 4. meat, Br. Poultry Sci., one time is 155-165 here is 747 -762??? 5. application., …Symposium. 6. J. Nutr. 7 and 10. Waldroup P.W., Poultry Science or Poultry Sci. 9. as above Jackson M.E. 10 and 11. Bilgili S.F. and Waldroup P.W. , please check in all citations 13,15,16,17,18,19,20,22,23,26. 18. International Journal of Poultry Science. Compare with 19. 21 and 24. and 25 is it correct?	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	General comments: The paper focus on very important problem to find the optimal balance in methods of poultry feeding, poultry performance and economical cost of poultry meat production. There are many questions to Authors concerning particular parts of paper. The language should be checked by native speaker, especially “results and discussion” which was written in poor English and needs full revision. I have also tried to point for influence of poor English on inadequate understanding of what Authors wanted to express. I believe that Authors will redesign paper, because according to me the poor English and many mistakes in references are among the main obstacles to accept it.	