

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_99274
Title of the Manuscript:	Partially fermented African Locust Bean (<i>Parkia biglobosa</i>) meal on laying performance, blood profile and carcass characteristics and economics efficiency of layer chickens
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:

(<https://www.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The document shows a study to determine the effect of partially fermented African locust bean (<i>Parkia biglobosa</i>) meal (PFPBM) on the egg laying performance, egg quality, blood profile, and carcass characteristics and economics efficiency of feed in Lohmann Brown strain layer chickens (17-weeks old). However, I have some comments that are described at the end of this section. In my opinion, the title describes the research work carried out by the authors. The abstract is comprehensive, Nevertheless, I suggest to include a brief introduction and remove the subsections. The subsections can be improved, I suggest standardize the font size throughout the document and improve the quality of the figures. Personally, I think that the scientific quality of the document can be improved due to the discussion of results is not deep enough, considering that there are other studies reported on the topic. Though, an innovative aspect of the manuscript is the inclusion of studies related to economics of production. The references are sufficient. I suggest to improve the discussion of results including other references for example: TAMBURAWA, M.S. et al. EFFECT OF SOAKED AND FERMENTED AFRICAN LOCUST BEAN (<i>Parkia biglobosa</i>) SEED MEAL ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE, HAEMATOLOGICAL PROFILE AND NUTRIENT DIGESTIBILITY OF BROILER CHICKENS. Tropical and Subtropical Agroecosystems, [S.I.], v. 20, n. 1, apr. 2017. ISSN 1870-0462. Available at: <https://www.revista.ccba.uady.mx/ojs/index.php/TSA/article/view/2279>. Date accessed: 20 apr. 2023. Foluke A. Aderemi, Olufemi. M. Alabi, Mathew. O. Ayoola* and Loveth O. Oyelami. Evaluation of fermented locust bean meal (<i>Parkiabiglobosa</i>) as replacement to soybean meal onproduction performance, blood profile and gutmorphology of broiler chicken Journal of Animal Science and Veterinary MedicineVolume 2(6), pages 164-170, December 2017. https://doi.org/10.31248/JASVM2017.063 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>I consider that the writing and grammar can be improved. I suggest that the document be reviewed by a person, whose native language is English.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What do the authors refer to the degree of fermentation degree? How does the degree of fermentation affect the composition of the experimental diets? Why does this happen? How does the degree of fermentation affect the increase or decrease of the components in the 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>samples?, What other factors can affect the chemical composition of diets?. Please explain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Table 3 include an ANOVA to detect significant differences in the composition of the diets. Why are the results presented in Table 3 different from those presented in Table 1 (chemical composition of the diets)? what is the difference? - Include significant treatment differences in Figure 1. To what do the authors attribute the differences observed in the data in Figure 1?, Why is shown the hen egg production for 8 days only? What is the relevance of these results? - Egg shell thickness was statistically ($P < .05$) higher in birds fed 9 % PFPBM. The authors attribute these differences to the fact that more calcium was available for eggshell calcification. However, no calcium content data is shown in Table 3, while in Table 1 the calcium content is very similar between the experimental diets. In fact, no differences were observed in the ash content between the diets, which is an approximation of the mineral content in the samples. Please explain. - Show the ANOVA for all data presented in Table 7. The PCV differed significantly between birds fed 3% PFPBM and the control, to what do the authors attribute this difference? - To what do the authors attribute the statistical differences observed in the data shown in Table 8? Please explain in more detail. - Why is the conversion rate improved in animals fed with experimental diets? This is striking, since apparently the composition of the experimental diets was similar. Show data that supports this statement. 	
--	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juana Isela Rojas Molina
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Queretaro, Mexico