



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_34398
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of West African Dwarf Goats fed Pleurotus tuber-regium Biodegraded Rice Straw and Maize offal: Brewer Yeast Slurry Mixture
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	L77-83 Dry to a constant weight under the sun is not acceptable. Actual Dry matter content of the product is needed. Must be supplied in the Material/method (MM) Table 1: according to the MM real Dry matter was not warranted since feed was sun dried. If so give reference in the MM that proves sun dried products are equivalent to dry matter obtained in an oven specially built for that purpose. Supply ADF and NDF content of the feed used Discussion: in the whole discussion, most of the time T2 did not react accordingly to other treatments and t1 on one occasion. Why? This is not discussed. Explore the reasons in the discussion.	1. "Sun drying to constant weight" deleted 2. NDF and ADF of feed used now included as table 2. 3. No reason deduced for non conformity in response of T1 and T2.
Minor REVISION comments	L8 in keywords, WAD is not relevant since this abbreviation is not known and used by all over the world: change or remove From L13-17. Those 3 sentences, the first one beginning with «Shortages», each need a source (reference) for these affirmations. L20, sentence starting with «if», same comment, need	1.WAD deleted 2. References added to indicated lines 3.Active ingredients, concentration and company name as well as source of Dettol indicated in corrected copy 4. details of sun drying stated in the corrected copy 5. Details of all drugs used indicated in the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	a reference. L23 starting with «to»: same comment L26 starting with «one» same comment L55 Dettol: give the active ingredient, the concentration, the company name and where it comes from L77-78: specify how the drying was achieved. The apparel type and brand, temperature, duration, etc. L98-100: give more details on the wormers and antibiotic used (concentration of the active ingredients) L101: Specify how the treatment were allotted throughout the room. L119-120. Rearrange the format Section 2.3. give all the analyses that were done and methods or reference Section 2.8 What procedure was taken for repeated measurements? Significant difference and/or tendency was declared at what level of significance? Table 1: specify if the analysis are reported on an as fed or dry matter basis. Further it is very unlikely that gross energy is reported in Kcal. The data given seems to be expressed rather in Mcal. Please correct that. L152: Not signif diff at $p=0.05$...? Weird ? this must be a mistake. Give the real P value or correct the phrase L153 as well as for all the p values reported: give the actual P values obtained from the stat analysis Table 2: rearrange the format of the lines columns. Table is very hard to understand in its actual format, L258-260. Need a reference for that affirmation L262-263. If a tendency was observed then in the tables give the actual p value. L278-285 In the discussion, the fact that goats showed high intake days and very low ones is discussed. Was the intake could have been affected by ambient temperature and humidity? Report the day to day temperature and humidity in the room and add some	corrected copy. i.e. concentration of the active ingredients 6. Lines 119-120 rearranged as suggested 7. Analyses done as well as methods or reference indicated in section 2.3 in corrected copy 8. Analysis now reported as on as fed basis (Table 1) 9. Significant differences declared at 95% probability) or 5% significant level 10.gross energy now indicated in Mcal 11. Actual P values now indicated 12. Noted faults on references 38 and 39 corrected as well as entire references harmonized according to authors' guide.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	discussion relevant to that point if this might be an issue. Reference list: why is reference 38 in bold? Too much line spacing between 38 and 39. Sometimes the number of the issue is given in brackets after the volume number, sometimes it is not, Please uniformize throughout and according to the guide to authors	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		