[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	[Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences](#)
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRAVS_49056**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Production and valorization of maggot meal: sustainable source of proteins for indigenous chicks**
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	**Tittle: this includes production and valorization of maggots…….but the study undertaken lacks the valorization component** 10 In the abstract the author clearly writes about the experimental design (CRD) used in assessing maggot yield from the three substrates that were replicated four times. However, nothing is written about the design used in the growth experiments. Writes about 15 birds per batch per diet giving a total of 45 chicks for the entire study. Which design was used? Were the dietary treatments replicated? If so, how many replicates and how many chicks per replicate? 66-67 A reader needs to know how old was the manure. Was it collected immediately after being dropped or it was used after some days? Were there any measures to avoid seeding of housefly eggs in the substrate before dung/manure was collected since animals and birds drop these in the open where this could be accessed by flies before the onset of the study? 73-74 What were the indicators of maturity? Was it a subjective measure? What would be the implication of harvesting them at less than or more than 4 days? 93-94 There is need to indicate the chemical composition of the maggot meal, Do, D1 and D2. These could be obtained from proximate analysis to make the reader know the composition of the diets in terms of Crude protein, Fibre, Fat, energy among others since these nutrients affect metabolic rates at cell level. 99 Author(s) need(s) to clarify what late growth performance was since it's among the parameter reported to have been measured in the study. It may not be clear to the reader. 114-115 If there was no Significant different P=0.97 then why would you conclude that pig manure was slightly more productive than other substrates 119-121 Did temperature measurement still go on after maggot harvesting since maggots were harvested after four days and the period of temperature reading extends to 8 days. Couldn't the removal of larva have affected the temperatures recorded. Besides no justification was given for studying the substrate temperatures in this study 134-137 was this feed intake per bird per day or per bird per week? The author needs to specify. The underlying graph about feed consumption should also be revised to be clear (scale) on this on the vertical axis. 142-146 in relation to fig 3 It would be better if the author putts error bars on the graph such that the significant variations can be noted by the reader as it is reported. 164-167 What do you mean by relating. Is there any mathematical procedure (formula) to explain this? Clearly show how this was computed. Why didn't the author calculate the feed conversion rate since the feed intake and weight gain were computed? 165 Vs table 4: The table (4) referred to does not depict any significant variation among consumption indices 2002-203: What was the composition of experimental diets in terms of energy fat and protein, perhaps it could give the reader and the author an insight in relation to the underlying discussion. 216-218 Results reported by the author did not show significantly low consumption indices as concluded here. 229-230: No economic analyses performed to make such conclusion from the above study Conclusions drawn from this study should come from the results reported	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
	The author had grammatical errors like cow dunk instead of dung. Also needed to specify the period of study for the bird in the write up. This has been indicated in the intext review (comment section) of the article. Author should stick to universally accepted terms in the field of study e.g replicates not repetitions; weight gain not weight variation/change among others. NB: more minor comments can be found in the peer reviewed document	
Optional/General comments	This article is informative but can be made better if the above-mentioned concerns are addressed by the author(s)	

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Nakkazi Christine*
Department, University & Country	*Bugema University, Uganda*