



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
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 99: Initial body weight used for the study of what. State the weights Line 101: The groups were. Replace groups nwith birds. Line 126/127: SPSS(2007) not listed in reference section. Line 145: Table 5. Check wrong superscript placement nd correct for FCR,DPI,protein efficiency Line 159/160: The sentence is wrong. FCR differs significantly. (See 10% and 15% replacement levels. Use SEM to confirm). Line 160/161: The sentence is wrong. POP differs significantly (see 10% and 15% replacement levels). Usee see SEM to confirm	Initial body weights of 423g- 426g which were the weights recorded at the start of the experiment has been stated. The word 'groups' have been replaced instead with 'birds' as suggested by the Reviewer. SPSS (2007) has been added as part of the reference. The correct superscript has been assigned. FCR: ^a, ^a, ^a, and ^b. DPI:^a, ^a, ^b, and ^b. PER: ^a, ^a, ^b and ^c. The sentence on FCR has been corrected to show significant differences, considering the 10% and 15% replacement levels and confirming with the SEM as suggested by the Reviewer. The sentence on DPI has also been corrected that show that there was observed significant differences among the treatment means, taking the 10% and 15% replacement levels of POP into consideration.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 190: untreated bird <u>for</u> this diet. The underlined	Underlined word replaced with the expression 'with' as against 'for' that was initially used.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	word should be <u>with</u> Line 199/200: There is an omission somewhere. The sentence does not flow. Line 215; the reference is incomplete Line 257: Wrong pagination Line 270: why still in press after 11 years	The sentence has been reconstructed to have a real meaning. Lines 198/200 The reference has been corrected. This particular reference has been replaced(See reference 3). The issue has been addressed by putting the website, etc.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Line 275; state the pagination Line 282: state the pagination The number of birds used for the experiments was too small. Sixty birds, fifteen per replicate/treatment is too small any meaning result and recommendation for the study of this nature.	This particular reference has been replaced. See Ref 11. This issue has been addressed. This was as a result of financial constraint.