SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEA_25687**
Title of the Manuscript:	**PASSAGE RATE OF DIGESTA FROM SOYBEAN MEAL, WHEAT BRAN AND RICE BRAN DIETS WITH OR WITHOUT A MULTI-ENZYME SUPPLEMENTATION IN BROILER CHICKENS**
Type of the 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	Abstract and L 60-61: Number of birds in abstract and L60-61 does not tally. Authors should reconcile this. L 132- use "Table" not table. L 153-154: Authors should know that enzyme level was not tested. Recast sentence to read: "These response criteria were better (P=0.05) on the SBM compared to WB and RB diets irrespective of enzyme supplementation. Table 1: Authors should have analyzed the test ingredients (SBM, WB and RB) for NSP. Since this was not done authors should give at least the calculated value of NSP in the diets to support the discussion. L 182: Table 2- please replace birds with broiler chickens and delete "(g)". L 216: start with "The effects of diets on……..are shown in Table 4. L 217-221: Recast this to read- "There were significant effects of diet on villus height and crypt depth (P<0.05). Villus height was higher on SBM fed birds. The highest crypt depth was observed in birds fed the	

	enzyme supplemented SBM diet. L 224-228: Poor presentation of results. Please recast this. L 238: Growth performance. L 239-240: This is your results not discussion. Please delete. L 305: by [32] who observed that……. L 310: please report the finding of [33, 34. 35]. L 317-322: This is a very poor conclusion. Please recast based on your findings.	
Minor REVISION comments	**None.**	
Optional/General comments	**The manuscript addresses a very important issue in poultry nutrition. However, it requires few important changes before it could be published and I would like to review the revised version before publication**.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Siaka Diarra***
Department, University & Country	***Animal science, University of the South Pacific, Fiji***