



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10502
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance, haematology and serum biochemical indices of broiler chickens fed toasted sesame seed (Sesamum indicum, Linn) meal based-diets
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 (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	The needs a major revision	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 7 - Should read ... Serium biochemical indeces of broiler chickens was investigated... Line 9 - Should read ... treatment was replicated thrice, with twelve birds per replicate Line 11 - Should read ... The birds were offered feed and water <i>ad libitum</i>. Lines 12 to 19 – are too general. The authors should be specific about the pattern of the results obtained before concluding. Where lower or higher values were obtained should be specified. Line 26 - Should be from legumes, a conventional ... source for poultry. Line 24 - 31 – should be rewritten Line 42 - 45 – should be rewritten for a better flow Line 57 – what are the virtual weights? Line 61 – should be rewritten Line 60 – The composition table is incomplete.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Only the control starter and finisher diets are presented Line 81 – The ME – Metabolic Energy written under the table is not reflected in the Table. Line 84 – 85 is too general. Were all the data analyzed by simple regression? The statement is confusing. Authors should specify how the tables were analyzed. They should also specify what parameters were compare using regression Table 1 – the authors should include the following parameters Initial weight, Average daily feed intake, Average daily weight gain. Line 95 – 96 – is the total weight gain or daily weight gain. The statistical analysis should be reconfirmed especially figures 1 and 2 Line 99 – 101 – where is the reference for this statement among the figures present? Line 107 – 108 on FCR is a contradicting, authors should please specify the figure reflecting this statement for easy reference Line 114 – Authors should define T1-T5 Line 134 – authors should re-write the statement Line 152 – Authors should define T1-T5 Line 155 – The table needs total revision. There is indiscriminate placing of superscripts Line 249 – should read : Serium biochemical ... TSSM is presented in ... Line 254-256 should be re-written to bring out the meaning. There is a contradiction between the statements and table 4.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 260 – 262 needs complete revision. Birds on diets cannot have similar variation but similar values. This should be corrected throughout the paper. Line 284 – The conclusion should be re-written completely <u>Comments</u> Title: Ok Abstract – To be re-written especially the results and conclusions. Other corrections are as suggested. <u>Introduction</u> Suggestions are indicated. <u>Materials and Methods</u> 1. Not comprehensive enough. How were the hemalogical parameters and Serum biochemical parameters measured. 2. Table 1 is complete. 3. The statistical analysis is ambiguous. <u>Results and discussion</u> 1. Tables on proximate composition of test ingredients, diets are conspicuously missing. This should be included. 2. Table 2 on performance is incomplete 3. Positioning of superscripts on the tables	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should be reconfirmed. There are a lot of contradictions between table, result presentation and discussion. The discussion should be re-written. <u>Conclusion</u> There is a need for this to be re-written to avoid confusing the reader.	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ojebiyi Olusegun Ojeniyi
Department, University & Country	Department of Animal Nutrition and Biotechnology, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Pmb 4000, Ogbomoso, Nigeria