



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_33431
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Feeding Raw kapok (Ceiba pentandra) seed meal on the Growth Performance, Nutrient digestibility, carcass and organ weights of Weaner Rabbits
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	<p>Line 59. Stones and dirt should not be fed to animals. What does this sentence mean?</p> <p>Line 66. Indicate how much of each nutrient was supplied per kg of diet fed.</p> <p>Line 72. How long were the rabbits fed the experimental diets?</p> <p>Line 97. Move this earlier in the manuscript. You had to analyse RKSM before formulation diets, so change this to Table 1.</p> <p>Line 103. Generally the level of significance that is used is $P < 0.05$. I recommend re-evaluating your results using $P < 0.05$. Line 184 states that up to 10% RKSM can be used in diets. By looking at the performance results, I think that number should only be 5% of the diet. Maybe if results were statistically re-analyzed, the numbers in other tables would also indicate the largest amount that can safely be used is 5%.</p> <p>Table 2. What are the units for anti-nutrients? I doubt that they are %.</p> <p>Table 3. Should Avg wt gain be Avg daily wt gain?</p> <p>The FCR is really small. Shouldn't that number be closer to 3.5 or 4?</p> <p>Table 4. NFE, 73.89. Should this have a superscript?</p> <p>Table 5. Remove the T1-T5 headings and replace with 0-20% headings. Be consistent with the remainder of the manuscript. This also applies to</p>	<p>Line 59 sentence was recast to give better meaning</p> <p>Line 66 kg indicated</p> <p>Line 72. Period of experiment inserted</p> <p>Line 97. Suggestion declined</p> <p>Line 103. The data were properly analysed and well interpreted.</p> <p>Table 2 Units for anti-nutrients inserted</p> <p>Table 3. Average daily weight gain inserted Declined</p> <p>Table 4 superscript a inserted</p> <p>Suggestion effected</p> <p>Observation noted and correction noted</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	lines 167-175. The live weights of the 0-10% treatments are about 400 g lower than in Table 3. Why is that? The rabbits you selected may not be representative of the rabbits in each treatment. For liver, there is a ns superscript but different letters on mans. Which is it? Based on the SEM cecal wt should be show significant differences. Line 167. Isn't this manuscript about rabbits? Line 174. Doesn't agree with Table 5.	Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		