



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript describes experiments designed to characterize the feasibility of three dietary supplements (including one in which very little is known) to dwarf sheep. The researchers report that proximate analyses of the different materials and quantify voluntary feed intakes. They also prepare 3:1 mixtures of the diet mixtures and compare growth rates and other economically important performance variables. In the end they provide compelling evidence that the 'new/untested' supplement Moringa (a shrub) is a suitable replacement and may even be slightly better in some ways than supplements that are currently used. The experimental designs, the analytical methods, and the statistical analyses are competent. There are, however, many places to improve the quality of the manuscript to make it more useful and appealing to potential readers. Below I list some of these.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: Genus species should be italicized. Three or more abbreviations are not defined. I would suggest calling the four treatments something more identifiable than 1-4, here and throughout the manuscript (e.g., in the Results/Discussion). It forces the reader to continually refer back to which treatment is which. Abstract: The 'W' in the allometric equation suggests watts, and if it is weight, then Kg is not a measure of weight. Line 46: Unclear statement. Do the authors mean 'not'	The abbreviations have been defined This should not be a problem once the treatments have been well defined in the abstract and methodology as I have done This is the unit of metabolic weight ($\text{g/kgW}^{0.75}/\text{day}$), otherwise what the reviewer meant is not clear



SDI Review Form 1.6

	well documented? Line 56: the terms 'feed' and 'food' are confusing. I think they mean animal feed and human food? Introduction: Last sentence. It seems strange that the P. maximum is only introduced in the final sentence – especially since it is the base of all of the diet treatments. Can the authors provide more information about why they used this. Also, why do they use scientific nomenclature to refer to all other species but do not use it for 'cassava'. Also why do they switch between referring to it as leaves and foliage? Methods: Is the 100% P maximum considered to the 'ideal' diet for these animals, since it is called 'control'? Methods: were the AOAC measurements done in the authors' labs or at a commercial lab? Results/Discussion: Please include p-values with each claim/statement regarding statistical significance. For example the statement in line 112 and elsewhere could be better substantiated. Results/Discussion: There are several abbreviations (e.g., in line 119, 123, 178, and Tables) that are not defined and could be interpreted several ways by different readers. Please define these terms at their first use. Line 132: Change 'show' to 'shows' Table 1: Line 377: the statement about dry mass is not clear as written.	I mean limitation of Gliricidia in small ruminants nutrition is well documented as stated in line 46 Line 56 is revised The focus of the research is comparative study of the effects of the supplements (and not the basal feed) on animals' performance. P. Maximum is only used to represent the typical fibrous and low CP diet of locally reared small ruminants. The non usage of scientific name for cassava is not intentional. Leave and foliage are interchangeably used in literature It is not the ideal but the conventional in the locality They were done in author's lab This can't be done for table 1 because the data were not subjected to ANOVA but in other tables this has been indicated. CP, CF, NFE, EE, etc were defined at first use Line 132 is revised Line 377 is revised Sample size is already indicated in the
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Table 2, 3, 4. Why not specify sample sizes in a column? Also, the treatment names (e.g., 1, 2, 3, 4) are not informative. Please rename them. Also, consider using Bold font for the average values.	methodology. Treatment names 1-4 is adequate and conventional
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	none	