



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10513
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance and Carcass Characteristics of Broiler Chicken Fed Soybean and Sesame/Soybean Based Diets Supplemented With or Without Microbial Phytase
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Too many typographical errors throughout the manuscript. Sections 2.2 & 2.3: Very difficult to understand. Please re-write these sections. The author(s) used the word enzymes instead of enzyme in the discussion. Line 242: Please explain what is meant by "positive influence." The author(s) left me wondering if the purpose of this study was to agree or disagree with what is already known. It is difficult to understand what is new in this study. Originality of the study is questionable from the discussion. Please rework the results and discussion to bring out clearly what is new about the study. No consistency in the writing of the references cited.	All typographical errors were carefully attended to. Sections 2.2 and 2.3 were re-done The word enzymes has been corrected The phrase has been replaced by a better one but positive influence means increase in value The results now have a better look. References cited have been adjusted to conform to the reviewer's comment.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	ethical issues -: The term "appropriate ethics committee" is not enough. Please provide the name of the committee that approved the protocol.	This aspect has been edited. The committee that approved the protocol was a local scientific committee of my Department. We decided to edit the aspect of the approval since we did not use human subject or carried out any work that needed special approval.