



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_25167
Title of the Manuscript:	Feed Intake, Weight Gain and Carcass Characteristics of West African Dwarf Sheep fed Moringa oleifera, Gliricidia sepium or Cassava Fodder as Supplements to Panicum maximum
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: inform that male and female animals were used; The information of line 13 this is not true, because the treatment 4 (ab) is equals of the treatment 1 (b) and 4 (b); In line 14 substitute "weight gain" for "growth rate"; The information of line 15 this is not true, because the treatment 2 (ab) is equals of the treatment 4 (a); we suggest remove "It was concluded that Moringa oleifera is a suitable alternative to Gliricidia sepium as supplement in small ruminant diets", because no reflect the results. Introduction: we suggest remake the 3^o e 4^o paragraph because apresented the moringa as high to others, and this is not correct. Material and method: generally presented the procedures so that the work can be replicated if necessary, but not presented the method for chemical analysis (eg, protein, EE...) and duration of the experiment; the most serious was no presented with obtained differences in "ratio of grass intake to supplement intake", because the treatments consisted of fixed rates 75:25, how obtained this information? a alimentation was offered separately the P. maximum and the supplements? which alpha used for the test, 5, 10%? Results and discussion: Remove a table 1 of the results and discussion because it is materials and methods, no was informed in table 1 if its content refers	Line 13: Statement on CP intake has been corrected Line 14: Weight gain changed to growth rate Line 15: Statement on feed conversion ratio modified I do not agree with the reviewer about the conclusion because the result clearly show that animals on Moringa and Gliricidia supplements had comparable DM intake, CP intake, growth rate, feed conversion ratio and both plants had comparable CP contents. I do not agree with the reviewer on this either because statements put forward in introduction are hypothetical, it is not conclusive, it is the results that will prove or disprove such staternents. The method of proximate analysis was given as a reference (AOAC 1995). The duration of the experiment has been included (line 90). This is explained in line 88 & 89; note: quantity offered is 75:25 but voluntary intake is different and this is what is reflected in table 2 The levels of significance were stated in lines 380, 389 and 392 I do not agree with the reviewer, table 1 is part



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to complete diet or only ingredients; remove the commentaries the line 123 at 126 because it is information obvious, the animals treatments 1 was feed only with P. Maximum; remove or revise the commentaries in line 141 at 144 of the citation Theng et al., (2003) because the time to adapt it should planned before the initial period experimental, it is time of the adaptation not be informed in materials and method; revise information in line 164 and 165 treatments 2 (ab) is equals of the treatment 4 (b) and 1 (b), moreover there are is serious calculation error in table 2 for the values de intake of CP e CF; In publication actual about ruminants nutrition no is usually of the utilization the CF e NFE, we suggest for authors a reading of the article "On the estimation of non-fibrous carbohydrates in feeds and diets" (Detmann and Valadares Filho, 2010); revise information in line 213 and 213 treatments 2 (ab) is equals of the treatment 3 (b); revise information in line 216 and 213 treatments 2 (ab) is equals of the treatment 4 (b); Conclusion: Totally inadequate only presented abstract of the results. There is not ethical issues that compromise the manuscript. But many journals require all experiment with animals must submit opinion of the ethics committee.	of the results and it is discussed as such by comparing findings in this study with what was obtained in similar studies Line 123 – 126: Sentence deleted Line 141 - 144: Statement revised Line 164 – 165: Statement revised This statement is not clear please Line 213 – 216 revised Conclusion revised
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Title: Short Title and reflects the content of the article, however, suggest of substitute of the "Feed intake, weight gain" by Growth performance. Results and Discussion: remove the unnecessary sentences in line 111, 123, 184, example: "Values for grass, supplement and total DM intake are given in Table 2." substitute for "Grass intake was significantly higher ($P<0.05$) for animals on the control diet compared to those on the supplemented diets because the former were offered a higher proportion (100 %) than the latter (75 %) according with the table 2".	"Weight gain" substituted with "Growth performance" Line 111, 123 and 184 revised as suggested
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article presents topic relevant to animal production in the tropics, however, the absence of methodological information, unrepresentative variable selection for the topic and errors in calculations results generated discussions and conclusion unsatisfactory.	The corrections pointed out have been revised as much as possible