



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_30226
Title of the Manuscript:	UTILIZATION OF COMPOSITE MANGO (Mangifera indica) FRUIT REJECT MEAL IN STARTER BROILER CHICKS FEEDING
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. Remove words already in the title from key words 2. Section 2.2, line 3: environment NOT envirnment 3. Experimental diets: Specify whether soybean meal was roasted/toasted 4. Report results in past tense NOT present tense: Section 3.0, line 6; fruit reject 'was' not 'is' 5. Section 3.0, Line 23; Reason for ME of fruit reject being lower is NOT convincing. Be specific when giving reasons not referring to what has been discussed previously. 6. The reason for growth depression (low protein and low energy at higher levels) is not convincing. Why didn't you make diets (during formulation) to be iso-caloric or same protein all through by considering other sources like maize or soybeans? Did you consider Energy: protein ratios of the diets? If you had made the diets the same in energy and protein, we could probably argue that there were some anti-nutrients in the mango fruit reject that caused growth depression? Are you sure that they were NO anti-nutrients in the mango rejects? Tannins are known to bind proteins and carbohydrates, making them unavailable for digestion and utilization by the animal! 7. Why was palatability of the feed compromised? Could be anti-nutrients in the rejects such as tannins? If so did you quantify the tannins in the rejects? Although you mentioned tannins later, it never came out clearly in earlier discussion of your	1. Broiler, Chicks, Mango Fruit Reject, removed. While Chemical composition, Economics, Sun dried, Weight gain added 2. Envirnment, corrected: environment 3. Soyabean meal (by-product, after soyabean is extracted of its oil in the soyabeanoil milling industry). It was not full fat soyabean, so the issue of roasting or toasting does not arise. 4. 'is' is changed to was 5. ...such as the activities of birds and children which target the pulp/flesh of some rejected fruits, leaving more of the peel which has less nutrient density, might hold for energy as well. Even where birds or children may not be involved in making the fruit unfit for human consumption, the presence of peel in MFRM was capable of diluting its nutrient density, and so energy, compare with pulp devoid of peel 6. This comment is noted and appreciated, but the design was not so. The research is being done step by step and the suggested design will be used in subsequent phases of the research as already planned. 7. Tannins have been mentioned from the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-results. 8. It is important to avail p-values in tables to aid comparisons with α-value (0.05)	start of discussion on feed intake and growth because discussion on the proximate composition does not require mentioning tannins. Moreover an elaborate work on the anti-nutritional factors has been sent out for publication and we are being careful not to duplicate works; though they have been quantified. 8. P-values, provided. 9. All corrections done in the manuscript are highlighted yellow
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good article	