



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15068
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Nutritional Analysis of Egg Yolks and Egg Albumin of Domestic Chicken, Guinea Fowl and hybride chicken.
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<u>Abstract</u> 1.The authors should delete from the abstract Side headlines 2. in the abstract the author should write about the results briefly and full details not like in present abstract 3. The authors should change the conclusion in the abstract, because the conclusion should be about the results briefly not like present conclusion. <u>Key words:</u> the authors should write { , } between vitamin and egg yolk and delete { , } form the end <u>Introduction</u> The authors should check the paragraph from 56- 62. because the language is not good <u>Materials and methods</u> Which is true the number of the sample, because the authors have written samples in abstract three (3) and in methodology (6). Please control the number of the sample whole manuscript <u>Results</u> 1. The authors should check the English	Agreed and effected Noted and effected Agreed and effected Noted and effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	language, because the language is not good 2. in table (2, 3) the authors should write (a, b) up <u>Conclusion</u> The conclusion is not good, so the authors should write conclusion again according to the results	Noted and effected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		