

-----Original Message-----

from: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

to: Managing Editor

date: Monday, January 21, 2013 5:20 PM

subject: paper 2012 BJAST 2085

Dear Sir,

I have performed a detailed analysis of the article "effect of activated coconut shell charcoal meal on growth performance and nutrient digestibility of broiler chickens", submitted to the British Journal of Applied Science and Technology..

In my opinion, before the acceptance, the article must be submitted to some changes, to note:

Change the lines 42-71 as follow:

The final product is called activated charcoal (*Osol.1975*). Charcoal acts as an insoluble carrier that non-specifically absorbed molecule, thereby preventing their absorption. Several researchers have tested the efficacy of activated charcoal in binding mycotoxins. Ayanwale *et al.*, (2006) found that the addition of different levels of activated sheabutter tree charcoal to laying pullets significantly ($p<0.05$) improved egg weight and quality. The results were attributed to increased mineral intake and utilization enhanced by charcoal supplementation and also improved absorption capacity of charcoal for dietary fat. Choi *et al.* (2009) investigated the feeding value of wood vinegar in weanling pigs and showed that wood vinegar added to the diets of pigs could improve the performance, apparent nutrient digestibility and selectively inhibit the harmful coliforms. There were many advantages of adding charcoal to animal diets as it controls lactic acid concentration in the gastrointestinal tract of ruminant, maintaining of pH level and micro flora in the rumen of steers (Ghosh *et al.*, 1991 and Jean,2010) and controls pathogenic bacteria (Nikolacia *et al.*, 1994). In Nigeria and indeed many other countries, various feeds and additives are incorporated into poultry diets to ensure maximum productivity. Therefore the aim of this research was to evaluate the effect of activated coconut shell charcoal meal on growth performance and nutrient digestibility of broiler chickens

Line 81: please add how many time starter and finisher diets were administered

Line 81: change "liter" as "litter"

Line 85: change "programme" as "program"; change "Routine" as "routine"

Change the footnote of table 1 as follow: Each 2.5kg contain: vit. A 10,000,000 IU; vit D 2,000,000 IU; vit. E 20,000 IU; vit. K 2,250 mg; thiamine 170mg; riboflavin 5,000mg; pyridoxine 2,750mg; niacin 27,500mg; vit B12 15mg; pantothenic acid 7,500mg; folic acid 7,500mg; biotin 50mg; manganese 80g; zinc 50g; copper 5g; iodine 1.5g; selenium 200mg and cobalt 200mg;

Activated coconut shell charcoal supplementation (starter and finisher phase) at

0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, and 2 kg per 100kg of diet.

Lines 128-130: the period is not true because of, as the same authors reported some rows after, the weight gain was not different among groups.

Lines 131-134: as there are no significant differences among BWG, the comment was not adequate and have to be deleted or changed

Line 165: change the period "The mean feed intake was ($P<0.05$) different at the starter phase." As follow: The mean feed intake of 2% supplement group was higher ($P<0.05$) than the control and the other supplemented groups during the starter phase.

Lines 171-172 change as follow: The starter phase revealed higher ($P<0.05$) efficiency of feed with the birds fed control diets (0% charcoal supplementation) in respect of the 2% supplemented group; it could be that increased supplementation reduced utilization of feed by the broilers.

Table 4: delete the data on fibre digestibility as are too high for poultry!!!.

Lines 191-192: delete the period on the fibre digestibility.

Line 193: the phrase on ash digestibility is not complete.

The conclusions have to be rewritten according to the results: no positive effect on growth rate and body weight gain; the feed intake was increased, the feed efficiency ratio of the protein was not different among the control and the supplemented groups.

Best regards,

XXX YYY

Note: Modification was done in this email ONLY to hide the identity.