



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_34966
Title of the Manuscript:	HOT RED PEPPER (Capsicum annuum L.) AS A DIET SUPPLEMENT IN BROILERS: Performance, Immuno-stimulatory effects and blood biochemicals
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 (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	<p>Comments are attached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction is incomplete 2. Clarification should be made on diet source and or preparation 3. There is wrong interpretation of some result parameters based on the set probability. This has affected result presentation and description. It has also affected the discussion. These should be adjusted to reflect the true situation of the results and discussions. <p>Reviewer comments:</p> <p>Find below comments on the article: MS-JEAI-34966-pdf</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Line number</th> <th>Comment(s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1-4</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title should have same latter case; not some words upper and some lower. Follow the journal guide. 2. Broilers ?)(broiler chickens suggested) </td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-10</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first sentence in the Abstract is dull. Adjust it. (A study was conducted using... suggested) 2. Ideas are not properly linked. For instance, experimental design </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Line number	Comment(s)	1-4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title should have same latter case; not some words upper and some lower. Follow the journal guide. 2. Broilers ?)(broiler chickens suggested) 	7-10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first sentence in the Abstract is dull. Adjust it. (A study was conducted using... suggested) 2. Ideas are not properly linked. For instance, experimental design 	
Line number	Comment(s)							
1-4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title should have same latter case; not some words upper and some lower. Follow the journal guide. 2. Broilers ?)(broiler chickens suggested) 							
7-10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first sentence in the Abstract is dull. Adjust it. (A study was conducted using... suggested) 2. Ideas are not properly linked. For instance, experimental design 							

Comment [u1]: BROILER CHICKENS WAS ADOPTED

Comment [u2]: PEPPER PRODUCTION WAS INCLUDED IN REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Comment [u3]: A STUDY WAS CONDUCTED WAS ADOPTED



SDI Review Form 1.6

		and treatments/replicates partitioning should be together in one sentence or at least follow each other, rather than being isolated.	
	10-12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You may need to explain what you mean by supplement since you are using both supplement and additive to mean the same thing. I advise that you hold to one, as it is appropriate. 2. The acronym "CRD" should come immediately after the name and not after adopted. 3. Broiler "chicks", line 11, should be Chickens 4. "Commercial broiler diets used were formulated to meet the nutrient requirements of broiler chicks containing HRP at levels 0%, 1.0%, 1.25% and 1.5%". This is confusing. If you used commercial feeds, why do you talk about you, formulating them again? 	
	14-16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considering your p-values, feed intake and body weight gain were not significantly different ($P>0.05$). You may reconsider all write up on these parameters. "Average Feed Intake(AFI)" on line 14, should have space between intake and (AFI) 2. Adjust the sentence on line 14 to bring out the meaning more clearly. 3. On what basis do you assign superiority to some treatments on Cost per kg gain, when it was not subjected to statistical analysis? I advise that you analyze it as well. 	
	19-23	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Packed cell volume (PCV) and haemoglobin (HB) indices recorded were similar in diets 1(28.57%), 2(28.68%), 3(28.89%), 4(28.77%) and 9.86g/dl; 9.71g/dl; 9.97g/dl; and 9.88g/dl respectively". This sentence is not clear. Rearrange it. 	
	7-26	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The entire abstract should be organized according to journal style. 	
	33	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2020 (Dougnonet <i>et al.</i>, 2014). Correct: 2020 (Dougnonet <i>et al.</i>, 2014). There are issues of non-spacing and over spacing all through the work. They should be corrected. 	
	42-43	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pepper was found to improve feed... I suggest you use reported, instead of found. 	
	44-52	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is lack of flow of ideas or sense among sentences in this range. For instance piperine is mentioned disorderly, disrupting the flow of points being made. Correct it. 	

Comment [u4]: SUPPLEMENTED WITH ADOPTED

Comment [u5]: COMMERCIAL DIETS NOT FORMULATED DIETS

Comment [u6]: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS WERE RE-RUN

Comment [u7]: PEPPER WAS REPORTED ADOPTED



SDI Review Form 1.6

	58-59	1. This sentence: "In research of Al-Kassie et al. (2012). Hot red peppers (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> 59 L.) are one of the most important spices that are widely used in human nutrition", is not correct. Change it completely.	
	31-69	1. Sentences should be dominated by active sentences 2. Reports/reported should be used instead of found 3. Two important aspects of pepper are missing in the review: pepper production, quantity, quality and economic value and pepper processing, products and by products. Write on these aspect of pepper in the review (introduction).	
	74-78	1. Explain more how the diets were prepared since commercial and formulated diets are been mentioned at the same time. If you formulated the diets, show a complete table of the diets and how the pepper was included in the diets. If the feeds were bought, mention the manufacturing company. Also show how you ensured iso-caloric and nitrogenous levels across the diets; with increasing levels of pepper.	
	82-87	1. "Vaccination programmes were strictly followed". Mention the source of your vaccination guide. 2. Ad libitum should be italicized.	
	89-96	1. "5ml for biochemical analysis, while the other part was poured in bottlecontaining measured quantities of EDTA (anticoagulant for haematological analysis)". This is not a sentence. Correct it.	
	Table 3	1. Considering the p values (0.08; 0.11) for average daily feed intake and weight gain, the parameters were not significantly affected ($p > 0.05$) across treatment groups. Results and discussions must be adjusted to reflect the true situation. 2. Repeating much of the mean values of results already in the table is unnecessary. 3. Cost per kg additive is not correct. It cannot be that low. Cross check. It may also be that you mean cost of additive per kg diet (?) 4. Cost per kg weight gain and cost of feed consumed should be subjected to statistical analysis 5. Foot note and title for all tables should conform to journal format.	
	Table 4	1. Why assign superscripts to WBC, Moncyt and lymphocyt, when p values show that there was no significant difference ($p > 0.05$)	

Comment [u8]: REPORTED WAS ACTIVELY USED ALL THROUGH

Comment [u9]: OLOMU, 2003 IS THE SOURCE

Comment [u10]: IT HAS BEEN ITALICIZED

Comment [u11]: IT HAS BEEN RE-WRITE

Comment [u12]: CORRECTED

Comment [u13]: CORRECTED



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>among the treatment groups for these parameters?</p> <p>2. Table below table 4 has no title</p> <p>3. Superscripts for ALT, HDL, triglycerides, cholesterol and glucose are not meaningful.</p>	
	118-139	<p>1. Results are not properly reported. Report results and refer to where they are (what table?), before discussion follows.</p>	
	198-267	<p>1. Adedoyin et al. 2016 has 'a', but there is no 'b'. Cross check your references and list 'b' also.</p> <p>2. There is inconsistency in the way you are writing the journal names. Ensure you follow journal pattern.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments			
<u>Optional/General</u> comments			

Comment [u14]: REMOVED SINCE b WAS NOT MENTIONED