



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_7254
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Dietary Levels of Rice Husk Supplemented with or without Commercial Enzymes on Performance, Nutrient Retention and Gastro-intestinal Tract of Broilers
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	The paper presents data on the use of rice husk as a ingredient in broilers checking performance, nutrient retention and GIT. The subject of the research fits well within the scope of AJEA. However, there are severe drawbacks that preclude considering this paper for publication. I am enclosing a list of main problems that justify rejection.	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The text needs to be revised by a native speaker. 2. In general, the paper has been presented according to guidelines for authors of AJEA. The problems are numerous and can not be described individually. Abstract: should be more concise and more equally balanced as far as the experimental design and the main results. The Abstract is not well presented and requires further improvement. In particular, diets were not independent and therefore, authors should have indicated L and Q effects rather than comparing doses of Enzyme. In the introduction, there is no clear hypothesis presented in the paper. There are too many confounding factors in the treatments to make interpretation of the results possible e.g. different nutrient contents (such as CP, EE, and CF) and changes in demand for specific nutrients during experiment The Material and Methods section: needs re-writing; lighting, humidity? The authors should clearly state the climatic conditions existing during the feeding trial. What was gender of birds? Male, Female or mixed? This experiment is not a true factorial feeding experiment because the nutrients	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of diets were not equal and balance. Moreover, no reasons are given for the need to the use of commercial enzyme in the utilization of high corn in chicken diets. What was the hypothesis to be tested? What did you expect to find? Three replicates are not enough for scientific study. Should be provided a rationale for this situation. You should develop a better argument as to why this design is justified and makes biological or practical sense. Therefore part of corn in experiment must omit and the part of rice husk with or without enzyme must present. My Suggestion: Title: Effects of Rice Husk Supplemented with or without Commercial Enzyme on Performance, Nutrient Retention and Gastro-intestinal Tract of Broilers. Aim: The effect of substituting of Rice Husk of 50% (RH) for corn in diets with commercial enzyme at 0 (0E), 100 (100E), 150(150E) or 350 (350E) mg/kg (or ppm) from ... to ... d of age on performance, nutrient retention and gastrointestinal tract (GIT) of Broilers. In order to evaluate statistically the measured data, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed in a completely randomized design. Also, results from treatment diets Enzyme 0– Enzyme 4 should be analyzed as an orthogonal polynomial. Linear quadratic and cubic effects were determined by orthogonal polynomial contrasts.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Table 1. Ingredients of basal diet and calculated nutrient composition (g kg⁻¹, as fed basis)

Ingredient (%)	0E	100E	150E	350E
Corn**	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
Rice husk	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
Groundnut cake	26.80	26.80	26.80	26.80
Blood meal	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Palm kernel cake	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Fish meal	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Corn milling waste	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Bone meal	2.35	2.35	2.35	2.35
Palm oil	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Oyster shell	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Salt	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Premix ¹	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
DL-Methionine	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Analyzed and calculated nutrient content (kg)				
ME (MJ/kg)	11.25	11.30	11.35	11.31
Dry matter	86.75	87.65	87.72	87.92
Crude Protein	20.65	20.70	20.77	20.76
Ether extract**	10.25	10.33	10.65	10.77
Crude fibre	10.05	10.10	10.07	10.12
Lysine	?	?	?	?
Methionine	?	?	?	?
Threonine	?	?	?	?
Methionine + cysteine	?	?	?	?
Calcium	?	?	?	?
Available P	?	?	?	?

*A better word too implies crop and scientific aspects would be in order.

** CRE0, CRE100 CRE150 CRE350 diets consisted of 25 corn and 25% rice husk without enzyme or with 100, 150 and 350 ppm enzyme.

¹ provided per Kg; Vit.A 4,000IU; Vit.D 8000IU; Vit.E 4,000mg; Vit.K 900mg; Vit.B1 500mg; Vit.B2 2000mg; Vit.B3 5,500mg; choline chloride 15,000mg; Antioxidant (BHT) 0.05%; iron 1.8%; copper 0.2%; manganese 2.4%; cobalt 0.05%; zinc 2.8%; iodine 0.04%; selenium 0.18%; calcium 12.8% .



SDI Review Form 1.6

The **results**, including tables. should be coherently presented

Table 2, 3, and 4 should be as following

	Diets				SEM	P	Effects		
	OE	100E	150E	350E			L	Q	C
Initial body weight, g/bird									
Daily weight gain, g/bird									
Daily feed intake, g/bird									
Feed efficiency, g feed/g gain									

Discussion: There is the need for the author to rewrite this section in a more concise form. How do the authors explain the effects observed in relation to the nature of the test product and its presumed mode of action?



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Conclusions could be improved because they are a literal description of results.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The main problem found in the manuscript is related to the redaction style of the abstract and the materials and methods, results ad discussion section. The authors must improve them for better comprehension.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer