



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14400
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance and Carcass Evaluation of Broilers fed Whole Millet Meal in a Humid Tropical Environment
Type of the Article	Original

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	The manuscript presented in accordance with the standards of the journal. A quick reference to sites of plagiarism, was obtained favorable results pragrafos containing plagiarism in the introduction, so I recommend revising or redoing introduction of the manuscript. Methodology recommend further explanation of accommodation of animals, for example, so that other researchers can approach had reproduced. There was the use of a probiotic in food? Please cite the source of the figures. In the text are not cited figures. Results are unpublished and statistical analysis were sufficient to confirm the findings made. The discussion is grounded in the literature and adds new Recommend the inclusion of the number of the Ethics Committee for animal research of the institution where the research was conducted protocol.	All references now properly included to acknowledge the originators. Now included, the Figures now deleted (removed). No use of probiotic in food. Followed strictly the rules of the Faculty Ethic Committee on animal research



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The conclusion is based on findings presented in the results.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	If there are any ethical issues please clarify.	No ethical issues