



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_27355
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance and tibia characteristics of chickens fed cassava chips supplemented with DL-methionine
Type of the Article	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	A conjunction should be included at Line 40 to read thus: "Weekly voluntary feed intake (FI) and body weight gain (BWG) were recorded....." Delete the phrase 'according to their treatment' from Line 42. The original statement should end after the reference '....described by Ogunwole [11].' Add an apostrophe sign to the last word in Line 46. Line 47: Mean differences are not 'separated' but 'analysed' (right terminology). So the author should restructure the sentence to read thus: "Differences among treatments' means were analysed to ascertain significance at p<0.05 using Duncan's multiple range test." The methodology section is not yet satisfactory. Information on formulated (supplemented) feeds used in this study is lacking in this section. A clear description of how the "...5 dietary levels of cassava chips (0, 25, 50, 75 and 100 corn replacement) and 4 dietary levels of DL-methionine supplementation (0, 0.05, 0.1 and 0.2 % i.e. 0, ½ NRC, NRC and double NRC 1994 recommended levels)...." were prepared, as stated in the abstract, should be clearly provided in the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	methodology section and, where possible, in a tabular form. Such a table should also be cited in the methodology section. In Line 56, the feeds being referred to should be clearly stated. For example in Line 56, "Birds on 50 % (797.99±29.51 g), 75 % (645.49±23.55 g) and 100 % (638.19±29.07g " could be reported in the form below: Birds fed 50 % CCR (797.99±29.51 g), etc; where CCR denotes feeds supplemented with cassava chips. Or simply as: "Birds fed 50 % cassava chips (797.99±29.51 g), 75 % cassava chips (645.49±23.55 g) and 100 % cassava chips (638.19±29.07g " In Line 57, ..." had significantly (P<0.05) BDG than the control (799.66±26.48 g) at the starter phase",..... Include the word 'decreased' after 'significantly'. Correct 'BDG' to BWG (body weight gain). In Line 64, '.....The FCR were.....' add 's' to FCR to become FCRs In Line 66, '..... while 1/2NRC (1.95±0.33) were similar to the control.....' Correct the word 'were' to 'was' Similarly in Line 66, '.....The BWG were significantly..." add 's' to BWG to become BWGs	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Begin the sentence in Line 72 with a definite article: 'The' Lines 106 - 109: The conclusion is good but can be improved on by the author. As an addendum, based on the findings of the present study, the author should state as part of the conclusion, the most effective supplemented diet (with respect to cassava chips and DL-Methionine) identified via this study. This should reflect in the conclusion. The author should stick to the use of BWG for 'Body Weight Gain' throughout the article. 'BDG' written in the Abstract section at Lines 10 - 11 should, therefore, also be corrected to BWG.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The abstract is sound. It tactfully summarized the study's design, findings and implications of findings in a concise manner. The key words chosen are also very good. The study is well introduced and the objective of the study clearly stated in the last paragraph of the introduction. The introduction is satisfactory. The methodology requires little improvement as stated above. The 'Results and Discussion' section is satisfactory, pending implementation of the minor corrections suggested above. The references are relatively recent, relevant and related to the subject area under report. The references should, however, be thoroughly edited to the journal format. The research work is generally interesting, employed good analytical procedures and, no doubt, contributed to knowledge in the area of feed formulation for broilers.	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oghenetega j. Avwioroko
Department, University & Country	Department of Biochemistry, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria