



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_46144
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of cotton seed meal on the performance traits and meat composition in commercial broilers
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b>—CP, CF, EE---are also needed full words with abbreviation when used first time.</p> <p><b>Line-19-</b> sub-sector</p> <p><b>Line-34-</b> (CSM)---- repeated so one should delete.</p> <p>Line-46-47--- Besides, there is a very few research on CSM in broiler diets.----- not true—A lot of research is available on this topic.—justify it.</p> <p>Line-54- 'good and'—delete it.</p> <p>Line-57- correct as 'The dietary treatments were:'</p> <p>Line-80- form---correct as 'from'</p> <p><b>Line-81-</b> Fresh clean and safe water was made available at all the times-----delete it.</p> <p>Line-162-163-- that CSM influence higher feed intake and at moderate incorporation levels, feed intake can be increased-----not clear—re-write it with levels.</p> <p>Line-168--- feeding cotton seed cake---- check it CSC or CSM?</p> <p>Line-169-170---- Supplementation of lysine can help to alleviate the negative effects of cottonseed meal [20, 21, 22].----- 187-189--- But in this study, 100g L-lysine was added to all of the diets which did not prove beneficial in counteracting the negative effect of gossypol in broilers because average growth rate was similar in all of the treatments. Both statements are contradiction. Justify it.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Line-174-- findings of [25]? --clarify.</p> <p>Line-180-181-- some research [17, 26] reported? OR some researchers [17, 26] reported</p> <p>Under Table-4- Write as <sup>a-b</sup>Means with different letters in rows differ significantly (P≤ 0.05)'</p> <p>Feed cost/kg live weight gain (BDT)---Here need to clear about BDT?</p> <p>Under Table-5- Write as <sup>a-d</sup>Means with different letters in rows differ significantly (P≤ 0.01)'</p> <p>ASh --- correct as 'Ash'</p> <p>Line-204-22.57 to 23.08---correct as '22.57 to 23.08%'.</p> <p>Line-206- 'the observation was made for 35 days old Cobb broiler chickens and the similar value was also found'—re-write it</p> <p>Line-217---3.6±0.39 ---correct as '3.6%'</p> <p>Line-219- compare or compared?</p> <p>Line-221- did not showed--- correct it?</p> <p>Line-224-1.4±0.14---1.4%</p> <p>Line-225-(%)--- Delete it</p>	<p>Abstract— corrected accordingly.</p> <p>Line-19- corrected in Line – 25.</p> <p>Line-34- corrected in Line – 40.</p> <p>Line-46-47-- modofied in Line – 52.</p> <p>Line-54- corrected in Line – 60</p> <p>Line-57- corrected accordingly in Line – 63</p> <p>Line-57- corrected accordingly in Line – 86</p> <p>Line-80- deleted accordingly in Line – 87</p> <p>Line- 162-163- re-written accordingly in Line – 167-168</p> <p>Line-168--- feeding cotton seed cake (CSC) is Ok, in Line– 174</p> <p>Line-169-170- This part was re-written accordingly, in Line– 192-196</p> <p>Line-174- corrected accordingly, in Line – 178-179</p> <p>Line-180-181- corrected accordingly, in Line – 186</p> <p>Under Table-4- written accordingly</p> <p>Feed cost/kg live weight gain (BDT)- corrected as 'Feed cost/kg live weight gain (Tk.)</p> <p>Under Table-5- written accordingly</p> <p>ASh --- corrected as 'Ash'</p> <p>Line-204- 22.57 to 23.08---corrected as '22.57 to 23.08%' in Line– 209</p> <p>Line-206- re-written accordingly in Line – 212-213</p> <p>Line-217---3.6±0.39 --- corrected as '3.6%' in Line– 222</p> <p>Line-219- corrected as 'compare' in Line– 225</p> <p>Line-221- corrected as 'did not show' in Line– 228</p> <p>Line-224- corrected as '1.4%' in Line– 231</p> <p>Line-225- corrected accordingly in Line– 232</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	