



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36602
Title of the Manuscript:	Garlic (Allium sativum) Powder as an Additive in Broilers (finisher phase) Part 2: Growth Performance, Hypocholesterolemic Effect and Economic Implications
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	Abstract – The abstract should include a brief introduction and justification of the research. Details of statistical result should be included. Author should compare the result of garlic inclusion with control before conclusion. Result presentation/tables – Author should cross-check the statistical results. Superscripts do not show the result went through statistical analysis. All results on garlic powder should be presented in relative to control. The level of significance symbol ($P < 0.05$) should be cross check against not significant ($P > 0.05$). It must be used rightly. - What is the reason for highest feed intake recorded at 2kg garlic inclusion, if flavour was suggested to reduce feed intake at 4kg inclusion? Discussion- Author should discuss all result in holistic with all treatments. Treatments on garlic powder should not be isolated from control	The abstract has been modified to incorporate the suggested brief introduction and justification of the research. The result of garlic inclusion with the control (without garlic inclusion) has been extensively discussed in the Result and Discussion Section. The Minitab (Ver. 16) statistical analyses were well represented on the Tables and interpretations are in the footnotes ie same superscripts indicate similarity in values and where superscripts are not indicated means there were no significant differences among the particular parameter examined. No reason was adduced for the highest intake recorded for birds on 2kg garlic inclusion and actually, there were slight differences in the feed intake values of all birds on all experimental diets. Results were discussed holistically in respect to all treatments.
Minor REVISION comments	Materials & Methods – How many birds were assigned per replicate? Author should consider including this fact	Each treatment therefore had a total of 48 chicks and each replicate in a treatment had a total of 12 chicks.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be re-checked for typographical errors and grammatical mistakes. The manuscript is not well written in English.	The manuscript has been thoroughly crosschecked for errors and grammatical mistakes.