



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_5388
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY ON COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF NATURAL GROWTH PROMOTER (AV/AGP/10) WITH ANTIBIOTIC SUPPLEMENTS ON OVERALL GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND INTESTINAL MICROMETRY OF BROILER BIRDS
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 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 in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Throughout the manuscript, various numbers are repeated in the main text that are also presented in the tables (for example in lines 149-152). This makes the manuscript difficult to read, and is not necessary as reference to the tables would suffice. - The authors have some difficulty with the concept of 'significant differences'. Values can be significantly different, but they cannot be statistically significant. Only the difference can be significant. For instance line 135. This should be corrected throughout the manuscript. - I do not understand highest FCR (1.71) was found in group III. The FCR in group I was 1.87 in week 6? - Figure 1 should have a proper legend - It is unclear how the measurements for table 6 were done (how many slides, how many animals, how many slides per animal etc.). - It is concluded that AV/AGP/10 can result in better quality chicken meat for human consumption without any risk of residual toxicity. However, the latter (residual toxicity in humans) has not been studied. This conclusion is therefore illegitimate. - The list of references lacks accuracy. Several journal names are abbreviated while other are written as full. Scientist names are occasionally	We appreciate the keen observations and valuable comments of the reviewer. The repetition of numbers in text has been removed. The statistically different is replaced with significantly different. 1.71 is not higher but better FCR as compared to other groups as lower the value of FCR better is the weight gain per Kg of feed consumed. Three birds from each group (one bird from each replicate) were selected for intestinal morphometry. However due to space constraints slide of only one bird from each group are given. The no residual toxicity of the product has been depicted from other trials conducted on the product. However it is removed from the conclusion as per reviewers suggestion as it is not studied in the present trial. The references are corrected as per reviewers comments



SDI Review Form 1.6

	written fully, including full first names which is not correct. Also, There are four references to theses, which I would avoid as these cannot be consulted by most readers.	The abbreviation of journals and name of scientist corrected as per reviewers comment. The reference related to thesis has been removed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Table 2, group 1 6th, SE is lacking and should be included. - The supplier of AV/AGP/10 should be mentioned in the M&M, not in the abstract.	SE added in table 2 AV/AGP/10 removed from abstract
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript can be improved for the English language	