



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_32375
Title of the Manuscript:	SERUM BIOCHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF LAYING JAPANESE QUAILS (<i>Coturnix coturnix japonica</i>) FED DIETS CONTAINING SUN-DRIED MANGO (<i>Mangifera spp</i>) KERNEL MEAL (SMKM).
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	1. The title is not clear to the reader "need to be revised". 2. At the start of the Abstract, the author needs to have an introductory statement about livestock feeds mostly the protein sources. 3. Line no 24-26: The author is talking of human's lack of protein rich diet instead of livestock. He should curtail Him/Herself to livestock feeds. 4. In the result section we need a duration-dependent plotting which will postulate well the effects of the said diet with respective time frames/intervals upon which the data was collected. 5. The authors need to shed more light on the normal control group at the abstract and method section. 6. There is no rigor in the methods, some explanation are missing which makes it hard for one to replicate/repeat this study. 7. In the discussion section, the authors are comparing their work with unrelated feed types especially line no 84-88. 8. The authors needed to give us the body weights of the study birds within a given time frame. This is a very essential parameter in feed formulations. 9. The n=2, is not substantiate statistically to generate external validity.	It has been taken care of Not quite, because I am dwelling on alternative sources of energy not protein. I think am not out of place. I was saying that humans have not been able to meet up the recommended level of animal protein intake due to high cost of production as a result of hike in feedstuffs prices. Concerning dependent plotting I might not be able to do that, I have subjected the data to one way analysis of variance and P values included Noted Thanks, it is noted NOTED Each treatment had six birds (n = 6). Two were taken from each replicate because of cost implication. Thanks for the observation



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The references have varying font sizes which need to be rectified. 2. The use of SMKM at the title should be avoided and hence expressed in the abstract. 3. Line no 5-6: The sentence is not grammatically correct. 4. The tables have no legends. 5. I would prefer table 2, to be put at the result section for easier perusal by the reader.	NOTED NOTED NOTED NOTED
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The current research work portrays practical based epistemology, which is highly encouraged in-order to find solutions in animal production where there has been unavailability and consequently high cost of feed with right protein contents. It is therefore necessary to look for unconventional feedstuffs which are available, cheap, safe and nutritionally adequate to substitute for maize in livestock feeding of which the authors have addressed. However, the following major amendments have to be made in-order for this article to fulfil the requirement for publication in this journal.	