



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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This manuscript focused on assessing the effect of Garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>) Powder as additive in diet of broilers on growth performance, carcass characteristics, haematology, serum chemistry and the economic implication. Although the topics of the research are suitable for the scope of this journal, I have stronger reasons that hamper me to accept this manuscript for publication. The experimental design and statistical analysis are not suitable with the experimental design. Experimental design I did not understand the reason you used the levels 2, 3 and 4. Why did not you use the level 1, for example? Statistical analysis: The average comparison presented is not reliable. As you were using different levels as treatments, I do think you should use a regression analysis to compare these treatments. Specific details: Abstract: Esta secção deve apresentar a duração do ensaio de alimentação. Também deve ser descrito quais parâmetros foram avaliados; Introduction: The introduction lacks of strength. Aims of the study are not clear. Bibliographic references are outdated. The authors should present some references to the set of sentences presented in the third paragraph of the introduction. Table 1: Which ingredient was replaced with garlic powder? According to the table 1, garlic powder was not included in the additive's tested. Results section is depending on the statistical analysis performed and thus are not suitable. Discussion and conclusions lacks of strength and are speculative.	I am happy that the reviewer accepted that the topic adequately captured the scope of the study. I wish to humbly ask the reviewer to suggest the experimental design and statistical analysis that are most suitable for this study. This is not a factorial experiment! This is a simple completely randomised design investigating the effect of varying the additive levels of garlic powder from 0 level (control diet) to 2, 3 and 4gKg⁻¹ of garlic powder. Level 1 which is the control diet without garlic addition is the basis for comparing the other levels. Regression analyses does not apply here. Introduction Section as it is adequately captures the whole intention of the study and summarizes the review of the past studies on the use of garlic powder as additive for many diverse purposes. The aim of the study is VERY CLEAR. "This study is therefore aimed at investigating the effects of garlic powder as an additive in broiler diets at finisher phase of growth (26-58days) using such parameters as growth performance, carcass characteristics, haematology, serum chemistry and the economic implication of broilers chicken fed with garlic supplemented diet at different inclusion levels". References have been provided to the set of sentences presented in the third paragraph of the introduction. Garlic powder was used in the diets (2-4) as additive and added in very minute quantities (2, 3 and 4gKg⁻¹ of garlic powder). Ordinarily, the use of additives does not necessitate replacement. Results in the study are purely based on the statistical analyses as reported using the superscripts to indicate levels of significance. Discussion and conclusions are purely based on acceptable standard practice acceptable in most journals that I have published including Elsevier and other high impact factor journals.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There are failures in formatting the references described in the text.	References have been duly formatted,
--	--	--------------------------------------