



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_21980
Title of the Manuscript:	Adverse Effects of Anti-nutritive Constituents of Unprocessed Jack Bean (<i>Canavalia ensiformis</i>) (L) (DC) Seed Meal on Poultry Performance.
Type of the Article	Review 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Compulsory REVISION comments	The title is of utmost interest but the manuscript is not recommended for publication in its present state due to many problems including: 1. The title is on the effect on poultry but the content is too general and does not provide a critical review of the problem. 2. The text is poorly organised 3. The language is quite poor. Authors are advised to do a critical review of the subject under the following headings: 1. Introduction – giving a justification of what is being reviewed- availability and uses of the seed (indicate if any seasonal effect on availability) . 2. Nutritive and anti-nutritive composition of jack bean seed. The threshold of anti-nutrients for poultry where available needs to be stated. 3. Recommendations in poultry diets (broilers, layers) 4. Processing for improving nutritive quality	1,2,3. The focus and scope of the review work is on the adverse effects of the antinutrients present in jack bean on poultry performance and not on the uses of the seed. The uses of the seed are outside the scope of this paper, I have written a manuscript on the uses of the seed already. It is a well known fact that is it impossible to cover all aspect of jack bean in one manuscript. Research work is dynamic and it is a continuous process and new discoveries are made constantly. 1, 2. Please check page1 under the section1 (introduction) for the discussion on the nutritive composition of jack bean and table1 on proximate composition of jack bean, as well as part of page 2. 2. Please check pages 2 to 5 as well as table 2 for the antinutritive constituents of jack bean which was the main focus of the review. 3, 4. I refer the reviewer to part of the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. Further research 6. Conclusions 7. After the changes, authors need to rewrite the abstract and improve the language. 8. Line numbering to be complete. NB: I will be glad to see a revised version of the manuscript, please.	manuscript where I made mention of some processing methods such as: thermal processing, autoclaving, ensiling, cracking and soaking etc on the whole of page 6 (section 2.8) and I also stated other processing methods employed by other authors from my literature search on page 7 in the conclusion section. 5. I refer the reviewer to the section 3 (conclusion) the last 4 lines on page 7 please find below the extract from my manuscript in blue. "Further research should be geared towards examining the effect of processing methods on the nutritive quality of jack bean and in addition, effort should be intensified on devising ways of improving the palatability of jack bean for poultry feeding, in order to enhance feed intake".... 6. Conclusion of the review is well presented on page 7 in the manuscript, please check.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		7. The abstract summaries the review work and covers the scope of the intended research focus of the author. ISSUE ON LANGUAGE I am a postdoctoral scholar (I obtained my post-doc from Newcastle University, United Kingdom) and my first language is English. My first, second and third degrees were obtained in English. Additionally, I am a lecturer in the university for several years.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		PLEASE NOTE I am shocked and as well surprised that most of what this reviewer is asking for is already in my manuscript. I do hope the reviewer had time to go through the manuscript thoroughly. It was evident in the manuscript I received by email attachment that this reviewer did not make any corrections like the other reviewers (no part of the manuscript was marked-up or highlighted for correction).