



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2012_AJEA_2846
Title of the Manuscript:	Productive performance of indigenous chicken (<i>Gallus domesticus</i> L.) in some selected areas of Rajshahi, Bangladesh

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Page 4 Lines 151-156 and Page 5 Lines 157-161- There is a need for data to support these results or else they are allegations which have no facts 2. Page 7 – What is the explanation for the differences in GR and WDC between different Themas? 3. Pages 8 and 9 – Labour cost is an important expenditure in any production system. We know that in scavenging production systems, family labour plays a significant role, yet you have ignored its cost component. Don't you think this leads to overestimation of your profitability?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 2 Line 54-56 – Reframe this statement Page 4 Lines 125-131 – Delete ``in`` after the trait i.e., it should read (WDC, g). Page 5 Lines 159-161 – This statement is hanging, revise 163 – Replace ``holders`` with farmers Page 6 Lines 190 – Delete ``day by day`` „ 194-199 – This statement is hanging – rewrite „ 201-204 - Rewrite this statement, it can't be understood. „ 208-214 – Very long statement, consider dividing	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 7 Lines 216-224 – This statement is not clear, consider rewriting and make sure that the famers recommendations are clearly stated in case you came across any in the field Lines 231-132- There should be results (data) to support the Number of Normal feathers and Necked neck genotypes Lines 235-243 – Should stand on it own and be delinked from the previous statement. The use of the word “However” doesn’t apply here Line 243 – Delete “the” Line 245 – ACR is highest in Matihar and Poba and not Boalia and Poba Line 250 – Delete “the” before lowest Page 10 Line 305 – Replace “growers” with farmers Page 11 Line 343 – Delete “This forms a part of MSc Thesis by RKD”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper looks good but the mentioned corrections above need to be done	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer