



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12445
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrients Metabolizability of Nectar for Long-Term Maintenance of Hummingbirds and Effect of a Dietary Fibre Source
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This manuscript is weak from different points of view, here my remarks: 1. The author does not seem aware of the recent literature of nectar. 2. Some quotations are too old (pag. 10, line221). 3. The manuscript is not well organized, obscure in some parts, the discussion is verbose and too long in respect to Introduction, M & M etc.. 4. Some parts are too speculative (pag 13, line 300-309). 5. Pag. 16, lines 380-381 Exine is not composed by cellulose and the quotation say exine composed by sporopollenin and intine by cellulose. 6. It is not evident why ashes where added to the artificial nectar and their composition. 7. Why it is not reported the composition of nectar collected in the flowers by these small birds when wild ? 8. Why yeasts where not added to this artificial nectar? These unicellular fungi are present in the nectar of many species. 9. Why pollen was added to the artificial nectar but it was not controlled if digested. Pollen contains either soluble carbohydrate and soluble proteins and aminoacids. I suggest to the author to find this article, appropriate for this research. FRANCHI G.G. et al. 1997. Microspectrophotometric evaluation of digestibility in pollen grains. Plant Foods Human Nutrition 50: 115-126. 10. In order to improve the quality of the manuscript I	We thank you for yours revisions. 1. We have took into account all the information we were able to find, but could be that something was lost. If the referee considers that there are some papers should be studied we appreciate the suggestion. In any case if the comment refers to flower nectars we have modified from line 218. 2. Some old quotation could still be scientifically valid 3. We have changed the discussion in many parts. 4. It was simply an attempt to obtain an idea of the total protein intake from the number of eaten flies. 5. we have read the suggested article of Franchi et al. 1997 and we have modify the statements adding more information about composition of walls of pollen. 6. we added only macro and micro mineral as integration; ashes was the result of chemical analysis of all inorganic components in the nectar. 7. in the discussion we have concisely described the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	suggest the addition of a table summarizing all the experiments. 11. Inulin and not Inulina through the text.	composition of natural nectar. 8. we entirely agree; the reason why we decided not to add yeast is because we want to avoid, for experimental reason, a significant modification of the nectar content before suction. 9. we agree. We have determined only the digestibility of different nutrients resulting from chemical analysis. 11. we have modified, as request.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		