



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15291
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Alternative Housing Systems on Blood Profile of Egg-type Chickens in Humid Tropics
Type of the 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>
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Lines 24 and 95 – 98 2. Lines 32, 34, 194, 203, 206, 230 and 243: (P=.05) 3. Lines 33 – 34: “...so also the serum metabolites except for the serum cortisol which was significantly (P=.05) affected... 4. Lines 59: “Reference [10]...” 5. Lines 115, 119,123 and 124: “...as described by [22]...” and “...as described by [23]...” 6. Line 80, 113, 115, 129, 148, 158 and 187:	1. The experimental design was not well explicated. You have three treatments on two different strain of birds. This should be elucidated in your abstract and material and methods. 2. This has no statistical meaning, please check again and write appropriately. 3. The information has been distorted, please recast. 4 These are not appropriate for scientific writings, replace with: “Frohlich <i>et al.</i> [10]...” 5 All ‘as described by’ should be cited appropriately, e.g. line 115 should read “... as described by Dacie and Lewis [22]...” or simply delete ‘as described by’ and or ‘described by’. 6 Be consistent with your spellings, compare with line 32.	The designed was well described. Corrections made. Correction made. Done. Done as suggested. Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

“...haematological...” 7. Line 87: “...respectively as described by [20].” 8. Line 128: statistical analysis 9. Lines 104-105: “Birds were fed with commercial chicks mash from day old till 8 th week of age and thereafter with growers mash till 17 th week of age...” and lines 142-143: “The metabolizable energy and crude protein contents of the diets were formulated to meet the specifications earlier recommended for growing pullets and layers...” 10. Lines 195 and 231: “ ...no significant ($P<0.05$) difference.	7 Delete ‘as described by’. 8 The statistical analysis used was neither mentioned nor described. Also, data presentation is not clear. Is it meaning plus and minus SEM/SD???? 9 Please settle this contradiction. Did you formulate the feeds or you used commercial feeds? “ 10 Please check again especially the “($P<0.05$)”	Done. Done Clarification done. Done.
---	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments - Line 26: volume(PCV) Line 27: concentration(Hb) ,Red Line 28: Albumin(Alb) ,Globuli Line 30: hemoglobin(MCH),Mean cell volume(MCV) Line 100: Cage(ECC) - Line 29: "...some serum enzymes..." - Line 33: "...housing system and strain..." - Lines 34 – 38: "Hens housed on PCC had higher values of serum cortisol (20.05 ng/ml for SBL and 20.55 ng/ml for SBR) followed by hens on ECC (18.15ng/ml for SBL and 18.38ng/ml for SBL) while hens on DLS had the lowest value (16.50ng/ml for SBL and 16.00ng/ml for SBR) thereby confirming indication of stress with conventionally caged birds." - Line 40: "...confirming..." - Line 52: "...level welfare..." - Lines 54, 57, 158, 165, : "[1]- [4], [6]-[9], [33]-[39], [40]- [42]" respectively.	- Put and delete spaces where appropriate. - Name those serum enzymes. - Please add a comma after strain. - Could be recast as: "Lines 34 – 38: "Hens housed on PCC had higher values of serum cortisol (20.05 ng/ml for SBL and 20.55 ng/ml for SBR) indicating stress with conventionally caged birds, followed by hens on ECC (18.15ng/ml for SBL and 18.38ng/ml for SBL) while hens on DLS had the lowest value (16.50ng/ml for SBL and 16.00ng/ml for SBR)." - Replace with: "...revealing..." - Should reads: "...level of welfare..." - Should be: [1-4], [6-9], [33-39], [40-42],	Done. Done Done Done Done Done Done Done
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

8. Line 55:	respectively.	
9. Line 81: "...on animal is..."	8. The space after the last word should be removed.	Done
10. Lines 121 and 122:	9. Replace with: "...on animal welfare is..."	Done
MCH= Hb/RBC*10 MCHC= Hb/PCV*100	10. Please use appropriate multiplication sign: e.g.	Done
11. Line 144: "...grower mash and layers mash. The crude protein (CP %)"	MCH= Hb/RBC × 10 MCHC= Hb/PCV × 100	
12. Line 145: "Table 2 presents the proximate composition of the grower mash and..."	11. Should read: "...grower mash and layers mash, the crude protein (CP %)"	Done
13. Line 147: "...reported by [32]." And line 151: "...reported by [30] and [31]."	12. Should be deleted, repetition!	Done
14. Line 163: "...was no pathological sign of infection among..."	13. Delete 'by', and [30] and [31] should read '[30-31].'	Done
15. Line 165: "...reliable mean to..."	14. Delete 'no pathological sign of'	Deleted
16. Line 170:	15. Should read: "...reliable means to..."	Done
17. Line 194: "abc = means with different..."	16. The spaces above and below the bottom line of Tables 1 and 2 should be removed.	
18. Lines 198 and 325: "...chickens(Mitruka and	17. Is not necessary, since there was no significant difference.	Removed



SDI Review Form 1.6

Rawnsley, 1977).” 19. Line 199: “TP= Total protein; Chol...” 20. Lines 213 to 226: the space 21. Line 230: “...different manuscripts along the row are...” 22. Line 240: “...with the findings of [43] that...”	18. It is not well cited and how relevant is this reference? It is 37 years old reference! 19. Not relevant here. 20. Remove the space. 21. Should read “...different superscript along the same row are...” 22. Should read: “...with the findings of Ologhobo [43] that...”	The reference is old but still relevant in the field of animal Hematology. Deleted Done Done Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments 1. The text are of different fonts and formats throughout the article. 2. The reference are too much, where more than two reference s are cited could be reduced to two references. 3. More than 60% of the references cited are too old, they could be replaced with more recent studies.	Competing interest-: Yes. 1. The source of the experimental feed	Feed ingredients were purchased from a reputable feed mill at Iwo in Nigeria and experimental feed were prepared under hygienic condition at the feed processing unit of the Teaching and research farm. This is now stated in the manuscript.