



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_35734
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE COST EFFECTIVENESS OF GROWTH AND REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE OF THE ARCHATINA ARCHATINA FED COMPOUNDED FEED AND NATURAL FEED MATERIALS
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	Abstract is OK, but I wondered a little bit about your Conclusions. I quote "Though more expensive for poor farmers, Treatment II was found to have the best potentials for sustainability and economy of snail farming" Here, the second part seems to contradict the first one since sustainability implies a positive economic output. Also, you are studying productivity, but now you are moving into sustainability. Please review and consider rephrasing. Consider also provide some numbers associated to your variables (e.g. consumption rate, weight gain, feed conversion and shell length) Line 136: how long lasted your study? Line 17: please stick to journal's guidelines regarding management of statistical differences. Table 4. use at most two decimals. Adding more does not make more precise your measurements and might confuse the reader. Line 155: Again, instead of 0.00 or 0.000 use 0.001. I know that is the output the machine gives you, but in the way you presented it may be confusing, 0.000 really means that there are several zeros before you find a one, so it does add precision.	All the suggested corrections are salient. They have been effectuated.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 20: your key words lack descriptors referring to economics. Line 22: simply "Background" or "Introduction" would be fine. Line 116: I guess numbers between parenthesis under the first column are percentages but it would be good if you make it explicit Line 119: insects are not necessarily parasites. Line 131: it says "a meter venier". It should say "a meter vernier" Line 141-144: some authors refer to this as "Feeding Efficiency" Line 168: just for precision, it would be a good idea to include the feed intake value for the standard poultry diet. Lines 176-178: you need to be more specific and mention on what variable there are similarities. Otherwise is a little confusing to read that results are similar, and later than they are not. Lines 189-191: since you are not proving details on diets' contents it is difficult to judge about similarities and dissimilarities. Line 239: what materials? Please specify. Line 293: place the year correctly. Write properly scientific names (lines 268-269, 280, 287, 294, 298, 304) Consider to suppress tables 5, 7, 8 and 9. They do not provide additional information to what is mentioned in the text. Check your use of plurals throughout the entire document.	All the suggested corrections are salient. They have been effectuated.
Optional/General comments	This is a good paper but some sections are a little difficult to understand and follow. This probably comes from the fact that authors favour a particular treatment but their findings show that it is not the best. Anyway, the try to sell the case providing alternative arguments. Taking care of these details will improve paper's comprehension.	