



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms JEAI 34966
Title of the Manuscript:	HOT RED PEPPER (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.) AS A DIET SUPPLEMENT IN BROILERS: Performance, Immuno-stimulatory effects and blood biochemicals
New Title of the Manuscript:	Performance, Immuno-stimulatory and blood biochemical Indices of broiler chickens fed hot red pepper (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.) supplemented diets
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The Introduction should be improved by focusing on research with farm animals. When there are claims that an ingredient has so many different positive effects, one should be skeptical. Focus on effects on farm animals. Table 1. Were these values taken from a feed tag, were they calculated based on ingredient content, or were they from chemical analysis? In Materials and Methods, indicate which it was. If the results are from chemical analysis, cite the methods used. Spell phosphorus correctly. Are the calcium and phosphorus correct? Usually they are lower in a finisher than in a starter.</p> <p>Table 2 and others. If you are using $P < 0.05$ as the level of significance, then any parameters that are $P > 0.05$ are not significant. Instead of listing 0.05 when values are not significant, put in the actual P value, like 0.27. That prevents confusion. In statistics, there are no times when $P = 0$. Put in $P < 0.01$ instead.</p> <p>Table 2. I have questions about costs. In Materials and Methods, list the cost/kg for starter and finisher.. Were they bought from a commercial supplier? If they were, were the feed additives already included? What is the cost of each of the feed additives/kg? How much was added /100 kg of diet? What was the cost/kg of RHP? Based on the information that is provided, I don't think your calculations are correct. It is doubtful that feed additives account for 1/7 of the cost of feed. It is also not reasonable that increasing the RHP content from 1% to 1.5% raised the cost of the diet by only 0.5 N. It is unusual that no chickens in two treatments died during this experiment. When I multiply FCR by Cost/feed consumed, my Cost/kg Weight Gain is not the same as is in Table 2.</p> <p>Table 3. For lymphocytes, monocytes,</p>	<p>Effects on broiler birds had been included.</p> <p>Yes, values were taken from a feed tag with necessary correction.</p> <p>Control feed= 100g additive to 100kg feed Therefore; 1g= #21 Diet2=1000g hrp to 100kg feed 10g= #10</p> <p>Two weeks old broilers were used.</p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<p>eosinophils and neutrophils, should % WBC be a heading for all of them? If yes, then they should add up to 100. If the answer to my question is no, then use the proper units – maybe cells/cc.</p> <p>Table 4. The glucose levels of birds are usually about twice the levels that are shown here. Cite a reference that lists normal glucose levels for chickens, and indicate that the levels are outside normal levels. The Results and Discussion should indicate no significant effects on AST, ALT, LDH, LDL, and HDC. I think the author should indicate that generally RHP was not toxic at the levels fed, but that there was not much positive effect. All of these suggested changes need to be incorporated into the Abstract.</p>	<p>These are their % composition in WBC as expressed $\times 10^{3/\text{ul}}$</p> <p>these levels were within the recommended value of Mitruka and Ramsley 1977</p>
--	---