



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24217
Title of the Manuscript:	Digesta Viscosity and Microbial Load in Broilers fed Wheat-Based Diets Supplemented with Roxazyme G2G
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	All tables. Remove wheat-based from the title. The main ingredient in all diets is corn. Also remove wheat-based from the Abstract. Is the P total or available? Tables 1 and 2. Because the title indicates g ingredient/100 g of DM, include the Moisture content in the calculated analyses. Suggest Calculated Analysis in place of Calculated Nutrients. Not all items listed there are nutrients. Line 45. How long was each diet fed? Line 78. Shouldn't it be 10-3 to 10-7? Lines 86 and 94. Should provide the company and address. Lines 88-93. Add to line 69 to keep things in the order they were done.	Correction effected Correction effected Correction effected Re-arranged. These are laboratory equipment. I do not have the company addresses. Correction effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 105 and 106. Delete. When interpreting data from a scientific experiment, unless results are statistically different ($P=0.05$), they are not different. Lines 108-123. Delete. See the previous comment. Table 4. Values are reported for bacteria that are different from those in lines 75 and 76. The unit of cfu in the title does not seem right. It should probably be to some power of 10 per specified volume of intestinal contents. Why list results for E. coli and coliforms? How can the numbers for E. coli be larger than for coliforms? It is difficult to believe that the results of statistical analysis for some data are correct. In some cases, one mean is at least 10 times as large as another mean but is not statistically different. Examples are Bacillus ileum and caeca, E. coli jejunum and caeca, and Staph ileum and caeca. If your procedures have so much	Correction noted and effected Correction noted and effected The mix-up has been corrected appropriately.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	variability, then you need to improve your laboratory procedures before you apply them to collect data that you plan to publish. Line157. Delete. This is not correct. Line 158. What is gut integrity? Lines 159 and 160. What you say may be correct, but it is not appropriate to make that recommendation from your data. Do you have growth and feed intake data from this experiment? That would be very helpful. It is also the kind of data that would be used to decide if commercial chickens would, or would not, benefit from having the enzyme added to their diet if it contains 20% wheat.	Correction effected Statement corrected Information included and statement rephrased.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		