



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36325
Title of the Manuscript:	Carcass, organs and economic evaluation of broiler birds fed low-protein diets supplemented with the most limiting essential amino acids in ideal protein concept
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	Ln 79: Further laboratory analyses were carried out.... Specify the analyses, otherwise delete. Ln 101: Providing the whole MSDS of the amino acids which covers a little over a page is not good enough. At best lines 90-92 should be enough Ln 187: instead of NRC requirement which all of us can locate in books, provide the composition of the experimental diets. Ln 246&247: conformed to previous report. What previous report are you referring to? Ln 361: you cannot conclude on growth when growth is not part of your objectives. Which of your tables report on growth? Ln 375 – 385: Recommendations must be exact and be based on findings from your research and not what pertains in developed world. 'In spite of the foregoing, the economic facts abound.....' we want your own outcome not facts elsewhere	Correction is noted and implemented. Correction is noted. The whole MSDS of the amino acids are deleted as suggested. The compositions of the 2 phases (broiler starter and finisher) of production are provided as Tables 3 & 4. The previous report is cited. Thank you for your observation in Ln 361. Growth parameters have been reported in another study (not this one). Therefore, I have deleted the conclusion on growth. Observation noted and appreciated. Correction is applied.
Minor REVISION comments	Inconsistency in the referencing e.g. Reference number 6 and number 12. Please stick to one style	Noted and corrected.
Optional/General comments	The materials and methods portion contain a lot of unnecessary information just to give volume to the paper. The paper is reporting on carcass but there is nothing on how the carcass parameters were taken. I suspect the author has published the main article (growth study) and perhaps parts of the carcass data in a different Journal already.	The observations are noted and appreciated. The carcass parameters have been further highlighted and focused.