



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9112
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance, immune response and carcass characteristics of broilers fed with low crude protein and ideal methionine to lysine ratio diets.
Type of the Article	Research

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	1. The statistical method used has to be mentioned at the end of Materials and Methods preferably with the reference. 2. Antibodies against ND were significantly increased but were not significant against IBD. If the author like to keep this, it has to be explained why?. However, one parameter (i.e ND) is enough to determine humoral immunity. 3. No need to use two tests (ELISA and HI). It is not clear in table 6 and 7, if the titer was HI or ELISA. Moreover, antibody titer against IBD is not measured by HI but ELISA. 4. It has to be explained in the discussion why less CP (20%) with same IMLR is giving significant antibody titer than 23% CP?	1. The statistical analysis has been mentioned under Materials and Methods, and referenced. 2. Antibodies against IBD were not significant- this has been explained between line287 and 297. 3. Table 6 measured IBD using ELISA, while table 7 Measured ND using HI. 4. IBD study: numerically, birds on 52% IMLR with 17% CP provide the best immune response as against 23% CP but with 47% IMLR. This has been explained between lines 292 - 297. ND: Explanation for this should be linked to reason given in lines 339-341 and discussed in lines 347-351. Actually, not much work has been done on immune response as regards amino acids supplementation. Guess this study could as well be a referenced material for related studies to be done in this line.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		