



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27745
Title of the Manuscript:	Haematological indices and serum metabolites of broiler chickens fed Zysygium aromaticum, Xylopi aethiopica and Morinda lucida as phytogetic plants.
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	1 - The aim of this research is to evaluate the effects of additives on hematological and serum levels, However, the author should improve the bibliographic review to explain why these drugs were selected. Are there studies that point to greater weight gain? Lower mortality? Best feed conversion? Improved animal performance? Changed feed intake? 2 - The bibliographic review describes studies with effects on production, but no hematological values 3 - What was the basement to implement these herbs concentration? Which studies provide subsidies for the adoption of these concentrations in order to achieve effects comparable to antibiotics? 4 - The author doesn't explain what the purpose of evaluating the effect of these phytobiotics in hematological indices, that is, how the serum and hematologic indices can be used for deduce that the application is beneficial to animals? 5 - MAKERI et al., 2007 is not in the references. In this case, is necessary to adjust the in-text citations and references according to editorial policy and review all the citations. 6 - Between the lines, 28 and 31 the author quote a study that uses phytobiotics and have productive effects. Who are these phytobiotics? They are the same as the research? 7 - Lines 22 and 23, describes the conclusion that the use of the additives improves the health and performance of broiler chickens. These conclusions can't be asserted based on observed results. Besides,	I have made correction on the reviewers comment, i have change the performance and has also make correction on conclusion and the blood 2 correction has been done 3 The basement to implement the herb has been corrected on the manuscript which i titled REAL manuscript 4 The purpose of evaluating the effect of the probiotic has been explained 5 done sir 6 all these has been listed or corrected in the manuscript Performance has been removed 8 corrected 9 Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	this is not the objective of the research. 8 - Is there any fact that explain the adoption of supplementation in the initial and final phases? 9 - Describe the duration in days of each phase and the total treatment 10 - At Line 111 the author says that the PCV values increased with the treatments. This statement cannot be made because the treatments do not have the dose increased gradually but of different compounds 11 - The study needs discussion of the differences observed in Table 3. There are significant differences between the PCV values, neutrophils, lymphocytes and monocytes but the author does not discuss these findings and is limited to only compare with other studies in which there were not similar results 12 - Table 4 shows no significant difference between any of the treatments for all parameters, so the whole discussion justifying the differences between treatments does not make sense 13 - At Line 179 metabolic values cannot be used to indicate improvement of nutritional status because they doesn't differ. What metabolic rate should be used to indicate if there was an improvement of nutritional status? Based on what reference? 14 - Adapt the P value citation in accordance with editorial policy 15 - Adapt the citations in text and the bibliographic references according to editorial policy.	10 it has been corrected 11 The correction has been effected 12 corrected 13 correction was done 14 done 15 Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1 - Tables 1 and 2, that specify the ration, does not describes the additives, whereas they are added in 1%. 2 - At Line 128. What is the relevance of this statement? It is expected that the avian immune system was affected in any way?	Done Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		