



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15903
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE AND HAEMATOLOGICAL PROFILES OF CROSSBRED MALE RABBITS FED YAM AND CASSAVA BY-PRODUCTS IN THE HUMID TROPICS
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	Line 8-9 – The aim is described a little different from the title, my suggestion is to change in the abstract Line 10 – add “male” like this “ weaner male rabbit” Line 12 – You wrote 37% of maize in diet 1, in diet 2,3 and 4 put the % as well of each product Line 17 “though T2 though T2 had the highest numerical values in packed cell volume, haemoglobin and red blood cell” Remove this part Line 25-28 – I liked this sentence a lot because it shows the value and application of your work. So I would like to see more information about it (like data regarding rabbit production and so on) Line 32 – It is said that the products are readily available with little cost, I also would like more information about it Line 44 – “respectively” to what? Line 48 – You mentioned table 1, so you should put it just below this text Line 52 – add city, state and country Line 53 – Remove “and, which, ranges and the % of 75” add “,” after 95% Line 57 – add “male” Line 59 – the rabbits were conditioned, for how many weeks?? Line 60 – There were 9 rabbits per diet? Line 60 – After the second “Each” add “ individually”	Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected

Line 62 – ad libitum as <i>ad libitum</i>	Correction effected
Line 62 - remove “both”	
Line 85 – What about the STATISTIC??	
Line 93 – All the diets have similar fiber levels, how did you concluded this sentence?	Correction effected
Line 98-99 – Explain why the protein increases animal growth	
Line 101 – remove “control”	
Line 104 – No “,” in et al	
Line 104 – “rabbits”	Correction effected
Line 105 – “high feed” how did you conclude it??is it stastical?	
Line 109 – No “,” in et al	
Line 111 – “ Statistical similarity” does not exist, find a different term	Correction effected
Line 118 – add “There were no significant difference (P>0.05) among the treatment means.” After Table 4	Correction effected
Line 123 – You have already cited PVC, no need no write it again as packed cell volume, check all of this in the whole text	Correction effected
Line 123 – “compared favorably	
124 with the normal ranges for” change for “within limits”	Correction effected
Line 125 – “respectively for growing rabbits.” Change for “for growing rabbits, respectively”	
Line 127 – “but were statistically similar” change this sentence because it is not correct	Correction effected
Line 129 – “(YPM)” remove it	
Line 130 “(Table 2) remove it	Correction effected
Line 130 – “even as Hackbath et al (1983) and Tuleun et al (2007) observed that	
131 increased in dietary protein could lead to increase in RBC, PCV and Hb.” Rephrase it	Correction effected
Line 132 – Add “.” In et al	
Line 134 – “there were no significant diferences between	Correction effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the treatment groups even as their values were within range of" rephrase it Line 145 – What did you mean by “relatively”?? Rephrase this sentence. If you mean that in one diet there was more weight gain you should put it like that. Table 3 – SEM is a parameter that should be written per column and per line. (Example. Initial body weight = 500 ± 3.5, being 3.5 the SEM) Table 3 – You have an information that is extremely important and you do not highlight it (difference in final BW and total weight gain) you should add this in the text! Table 4 - add an “*” and write that there not statistical difference Tables should be just below the text where it is referred, not after the conclusions. Tables – just the first letter is capital Tables – add “(n=36)” in the end of the tables title. Revise all references according to the guideline.	Correction effected Your comment on Table 3 that SEM should be written per column and per line is noted. But this will be applied in my subsequent publications. Correction effected Correction effected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	First I would like to say that I liked your manuscript, as you could read before some changes are necessary in order to improve the quality of the work, but the aim is very interesting as well as the results. Do you have ethics committee approval??	