



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_22340
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative evaluation of composite cassava root meal, palm oil and crayfish waste mixture as substitute for maize in broiler chicken diet
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	1/ It's necessary to add the chemical composition of the different ingredients use in this experiment with their energetic levels particularly for Cassava meal, Cray fish waste and palm oil. Indicate also the percentage of Cassava, Cray fish and palm oil in the fortified cassava meal (CCPCM). How is the price of the maize and that of the CCPCM? 2/ Table 2 : the total of the ingredients is 101% not 100% for the 5 finisher diets. 3/ Are the chicks individually identified to follow individual growth? Is every chick weighted every week or only a sample (in this case how many animals per replicate weighted?). 4/ Table 3 : the initial weight of the chicks is very high. The weight of one day chick is only about 40 g (the weight of an egg is about 65g). Is the initial weight indicated here for chicks more than one day old? 5/ The final body weight in table 3 is for what age of the chicks? The duration of the starter phase of the experiment is 21 days (line112) how you calculate weight gain? It's normally (final weight – initial weight)/21 days. Same thing for the finishing period who is 28 days (table 4). Recalculate weight gain in table 3 and table 4. 6/ It's strange that the FCR is higher in the start period than in the finisher period, normally it's the opposite because the chicks are heavier at the end period of growing. 7/ The feed consumption is measured one time/week /replicate. So you have only 3 data/treatment. This is very few. 8/ Line 128 : How many animals were used to determinate the nutrient retention. Had the animals eat the same diet than in the finisher period? Can you give more data about the amount of the feed eaten and the feces excreted in g/MS by the animals eating every diet? 8/ Is there mortality observed in the different treatments? If yes how much?	corrected each chick was identified with a marker and weighed individually each week. The initial weight was taken after one week of age(acclimatisation) 5/the final weight was at 28 days. Weight gain was the differences in weekly live weight. 6/ after the chick phase the chicks were re – randomised, thereby separating and cancelling the effect of chick diet on the birds. 7/the feed consumption was measured daily. i.e feed giving minus left over 8/ 60 birds in all were used to determined the nutrient retention' 8/Mortality recorded was insignificant
Minor REVISION comments	1/ Line 10 : “The experiment involved three treatments..”, replace three with five treatments. 2/ Table 1 : total of the ingredients is 157%. You must replace Wheat offal 3% not 28.00	Corrected corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and Palm kernel Cake 2% not 34.00%. In the Colum of the diet 50% add 50% CCPCM.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Necessary to add some details in experimental design and to reverify data given in the tables.	done