



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45597
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance and Blood Metabolites of Broiler Chickens fed Heat Treated Jatropha Seed Cake-Based Diets
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	- Why one-week old broilers?. You ought to have commenced the work with day old chicks. Give your reasons for this discission. - Indicate as 0.05 for clarity. Apply this in all parts of the article. - Phorbol or phorbor. Which is correct? - Mention authors and the processing methods they have adopted. - Please add location of the site interms of longitute and latitute. - Why was this procedure adopted? - Please indicate the frequency/durations for which these indices where obtained. - Were they as similar in all parameters? - Is this your own finding now? Please indicate any supportive literature to substantiate this statement. Read the comments in the comments box in all the sections and respond accordingly. - I believe the journal style permits author(s) names to be represented in numbers to be properly listed at the Reference section. This is not the case in some sections of the article. For example, Wintrobe [6], Brecher and Cronkite [8], Bonsnes and Tausslay [10], etc. Please use numbers only. Refer to [1] and [2]. Be consistent. - NRC (National Research Council), Nutrient requirements of poultry. 9th ed. National Academy. Not in the body of the work. - No [5] in the body of the work. Revision is needed in the entire numbering. - Indicate analysis of the proximate composition of composite diet with JSC.	☐ No specific reason, in research, one can use birds of any age provided the information is clearly stated. ☐ (P =.05) was used as instructed in the author's guidelines of the journal as the correct expression of level of significance. Excerpt from the journal Guideline for Reporting P values: P is always italicized and capitalized. i) Correct expression: (P = .05). Wrong Expression: (P < .05), unless P < .001. ☐ Phorbol ☐ It was explicitly elaborated in one of my published articles on jatropha seed cake (Agboola and Adenuga, 2015). So, I don't want to belabor it here. Agboola A.F. and Adenuga, A.A. (2015). Performance and Organ Histopathology of Growing Japanese Quails (Coturnix coturnix japonica) on Heat Treated Jatropha Seed Cake. Tropical Animal Production Investigation. Vol. 18. No. 1: 1-8. ☐ Done ☐ "MODIFIED" as The processing method was done to simulate the technique carried out by local farmers as described by [5]. Reference 5.....(Agboola and Adenuga, 2015). ☐ Done ☐ Sentence has been modified ☐ Yes, my findings as reported by Agboola and Adenuga (2015). Reference indicated Done. It has been revised as suggested Done where appropriate NRC was in the body of the work, it was mistakenly cited as reference 4 but it is now....."Reference No 6" Fixed, I just changed 4 to 6, addition reference was included as "5" d and that settled it. Thank you for the observation.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I would suggest 'Broiler chickens' to Read 'Broiler fowls'. This could be most appropriate.	Chickens and Fowls are synonymous. They can be used interchangeably. I prefer to stick to Chickens please