



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>Have you received ethics committee document? The approval number (ethical committee approval) and date should be indicated in the material and method section of the article.</p> <p>Page 1 line 15. Raw kapok seed meal or kapok seed meal? The values of kapok seed meal are different table 2. Please correct.</p> <p>Example: 89.96% dry matter / table 2: 89.51% dry matter 22.63 % crude protein / Table 2: %22.59% crude protein Flavonoid 5.63% or 56.24% ? Please re-check the values!</p> <p>Page 1 line 20 Raw kapok seed meal please correct RKSM.</p> <p>Page 1 line 21. The relative weights of kidney significantly increased beyond 5% RKSM inclusion in the diet! (see table 5)</p> <p>Page 2 line 39-41. The information not necessary</p> <p>Page 2 line 54. 90 or 9⁰</p> <p>Page 3 line 60. Only write RKSM</p> <p>Page 3. Please explain how is calculated the metabolisable energy value of raw kapok seed meal. Please give the formula.</p> <p>Page 3 line 66. Please indicate how much premix was provided per kg diet</p> <p>Page 3 line 77. Did the animals feed ad libitum? Please indicate.</p> <p>Page 3 line 83. You have indicated that performance parameter were determined weekly</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>but the values were not given in the table 3. Page 3 line 88. You indicated that (Page 1 line 13) five dietary treatments replicated three times with two rabbits per replicate but page 3 line 88 indicated that three rabbits per replicate. Please explain. Did you implement the forced feeding? Did you collect cecotropes? Did you use a fecal collection bag? How did you prevent the contamination of feces with feathers? Please explain.</p> <p>Were you use male or female rabbits? Please indicate the numbers. The number of n was not shown in tables Page 3 line 83. Performance parameter were determined weekly but the data about it is not shown in the table. Page 3 line 87. Which digestibility formula did you apply? You should give the formula in the section 2.5.2. section. Page 4 line 97. Which method did you use to determine alkaloid and trypsine inhibitors? Please indicate. Page 4 line 105. Please indicate which version of SPSS was used. Mortality is mentioned in the materials and methods sections. Was there any morbidity or mortality? Page 4 line 126. Please give the unit (% or ?) Page 4 line 128. Please correct high higher! Page 5 line. May correct "proximate" to "Proximate" Page 5 line 139 Are the values of raw kapok seed meal as fed basis? Please indicate. Page 5 line 139. Please correct oxalate to total oxalate.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Page 6 line 155. Please correct “Ns” to “ns”</p> <p>Page 6 line 167. Broiler chickens or rabbits???</p> <p>Page 6 line 168. Please explain T1, T2 T3 diets.</p> <p>Also;</p> <p>Live weights were significantly higher in rabbits fed T1, T2 diets than T4 and T5. In addition T3 was higher than T5. Also, dressing percentage of T1, T2 and T3 were significantly higher than T4 and T5.</p> <p>Page 6 line 172. What does ANFs mean? Please explain.</p> <p>Page 6 line 174. The weight of heart was not different from the groups according to table 5. Please correct!</p> <p>Page 7 line 178. Please review the lettering of the lung again. Also please explain SI and LI. Please correct “dressed” to “Dressed”</p> <p>Page 7 line 183. Correct ant-nutritional to antinutritional.</p> <p>Page 7 line 185. Please correct “.” after the sentence.</p> <p>Correct references by the rules of the Asian Research Journal of Agriculture.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	There are a lot of writing mistakes in the manuscript. Please look at all the manuscript from start to finish and correct. Example; Page 2 line 47. Isscanty please correct "is scanty" Page 2 line 63. 5contain please correct "5 contain"	
Optional/General comments	The subject is original. The title clearly and sufficiently covers the aim and the results. But, there are some scientifically incorrect expressions in the article. The discussion so far is very superficial and only compares the results of the present study with those of other publications, but does not mention anything on possible or proven explanations for the results. Therefore, the article should be re-evaluated after necessary corrections and changes are made.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sule Cengiz
Department, University & Country	Department of Animal Nutrition and Nutritional Diseases, University of Uludag, Turkey