



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_BJAST_6052
Title of the Manuscript:	DIETARY EFFECT OF PROCESSED ORANGE PEELS ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE OF BROILER FINISHER BIRDS
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 (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	- Line 6-8 is not necessary at abstract. - At the title of line 62-63 must be write Location. - Manuscript and references are not written according to the instructions. - English should be improved by native English speaker; some expressions in the present text are difficult to understand. - In the discussion, as much as possible, try to discuss one item completely, and then move on to the next item	The lines (6-8) has being deleted as deemed fit by the reviewer. The location of the area where the experimented was conducted has been stated as specified. Check line 63 Manuscript and references has been written according to the instructions given. We have improved on our English. We discussed the findings accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Results and introduction are very too long that must be shortening. - An only result of the copy table is not anything new to say. - Author concentrated too much on the introduction of previous research More introduction about experimental animals will be helpful for the reader	We have taken care of this. The finding can still be useful to farmers. That is alright.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1- Some sentences in the manuscript (especially at introduction) should be rewrite they may have error of plagiarism. 2- There is no logical reason for their results. 3- The results need to be explained in detail. May be you can divide this section into several subtopics and then discuss each subtopic separately. 4- The aim of the experiments should be better justified.	We have taken care of that. The study aimed at providing farmers with the information on the use of locally available materials in the feeding of animals to reduce the cost of production.