



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2085
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF ACTIVATED COCONUT SHELL CHARCOAL MEAL ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND NUTRIENT DIGESTIBILITY OF BROILER CHICKENS

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	L7 conducted on, change to "conducted with" L9 allocated into L11 three replicates L12 were significantly L17 "there were" should be deleted L18 were observed L19 increased L30 "livestock industry. " Delete the period L34 ",consumption" change to ". Consumption" L37 ", include reduce" change to "include reduced" L38 increase in L39 , which will lead; "is" change to "are" L47 "work as well as" change to "damage" L49 from contaminated grain L50 are not currently available; A variety==Varieties L54 with increased L62 ", there were" change to ". There were" L63 ", as it controls" change to ", such as controlling" L65 Material and methods=== change the font L67 allocated L68 and T5 L70 three replicates Feed and water were L71 medications were L72 ratio and body weight L74 75 76 delete "with five (5) treatment groups and three replicates per 75 treatment. 15 chicks were randomly allotted to each replicate in a complete randomized design 76 arrangement. The housing System for the experiment was intensive"	Agreed 1.7-1.196 have been corrected as suggested



SDI Review Form 1.6

	L76 to L86 Change fonts and rewrite the paragraph L87 include: L89 scale; L90 scale: L91 weight; L92 ,and feed conversion L97 replicate were L98 daily and were L99 sub-samples were taken for L103 change font according to Journal requirements L104 fed on 2% L105 when compared L113 (Wang et al., 2006), whose report suggested that L115 (Wang et al., 2006) L120 Eddin (2007), who reported considerable L121 age and with Kutlu et al. (2000) who also L122 age. The increase L124 to L128 rewrite, not clearly described L130 phase significant (P<0.05) difference was L134 Wang et al. (2006) L136 moldy corn. The percentage mortality was higher in birds L139 Also leg problems were L141 whose report L143 fibre and ash L144 might be related to the crude fibre L147 Kutlu et al. (2000) also reported L156 wish to express L166 what is GNC?? Give detailed description L169 and 170 CP and ME for starter phase or finisher phase??? L171 Premix Each 2.5kg L178 Table 4.4 where are Table 2 and Table 3? In this Table, the initial body weights of all 5 groups were the same. And SEM is 0.00. Not possible, recheck your data. Protein efficiency ratio, what is the unit? Diet protein: carcass protein??? Give explain in your method section. L189 Table 4.5 should be Table 3??? Treatment explanation can be deleted since there were cited in above Tables L196 Table 4.6 should be Table 4, units of the parameters: %	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Other comments: 1. In your background section, mycotoxin intervention is your target, why you did not test your diets for mycotoxins? Benefits of 2% charcoal at starter phase result from which function of the charcoal? 2. activated coconut shell charcoal: some background should be given, source of it and some of its properties? 3. Methods description too simple 4. In L94 Digestibility trial, you did not mention the age and weight of birds on trial. Such results will not tell readers the relationship between digestibility and performance if you do not inform the condition of birds 5. Design of the paper did not investigate the effect of charcoal on mycotixin 6. More careful writing of the paper demanded, ie paragraph and Tables.	Mycotoxin interventions was not the target is only mentioned as to the fact that activated charcoal has the ability to stop their activities Agreed
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		