

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124157
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of the weight of the eggs of Flesh Roux and Kuroiler breeding hens on their hatching in an incubator
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript proposed to me for review is titled: " Influence of the weight of the eggs of Flesh Roux and Kuroiler breeding hens on their hatching in an incubator". This study evaluated the effect of egg size from two different chicken strains. In this study, it can be seen that beyond egg size, the incubator and the strain were factors that the authors did not consider. Therefore, the methodology and statistical analysis do not allow for a proper understanding and interpretation of the results	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>NO: the study did not evaluate only the size of eggs! Incubator and strains were additionally factors</p> <p>Influence of Egg Weight, Chicken Breed (Flesh Roux and Kuroiler), and Incubator Type on some Hatching index</p>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>What was the storage duration? 21 d isn't it too long? The maximum of storage duration is 7 days, extended the storage duration to 21 d can't affect the result?</p> <p>Please give the interval of weight! The small (xx g to xx g); medium (xxx to xxxx)</p> <p>What was the conditions of incubation? (Temperature? Humidity? Turning?)</p> <p>What is incubation performance?</p> <p>How many repetitions of treatments in incubators? What is the statistical model used?</p> <p>Statistical software?</p> <p>"The results showed that the average egg rate was higher (66.52% for Chair Roux eggs and 66.79% for Kuroiler eggs)". Higher compare to which treatments?</p> <p>The incubator is a factor? I guess the incubator were used for repetition. If the incubator is a factor, please, state the differences between incubators</p> <p>Which test did authors used for statistical analysis?</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodology and statistical analysis are not appropriate. All eggs are not in the same conditions and were not incubated randomly. The test used can't be apply to this study where there are 3 factors.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO: Authors needs a proof-reading English. The language (English) need to be corrected to make the manuscript readable and understandable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract What was the storage duration? 21 d isn't it too long? The maximum of storage duration is 7 days, extended the storage duration to 21 d can't affect the result? Please give the interval of weight! The small (xx g to xx g); medium (xxx to xxxx) What was the conditions of incubation? (Temperature? Humidity? Turning?) What is incubation performance? How many repetitions of treatments in incubators? What is the statistical model used? Statistical software? "The results showed that the average egg rate was higher (66.52% for Chair Roux eggs and 66.79% for Kuroiler eggs)". Higher compare to which treatments? The incubator is a factor? I guess the incubator were used for repetition. If the incubator is a factor, please, state the differences between incubators Which test did authors used for statistical analysis?</p> <p>Introduction The introduction should be rewritten. The problem of the study is missing from the introduction The state of art is missing from the introduction Please give more information about the strains used. Many studies have been already conducted to determine the average egg weight to be incubated for a good hatchability. Previous studies regarding the topic are missing from the introduction</p> <p>Material and Methods Biological Material How eggs were collected? What is the storage duration? In which conditions eggs have been stored during the 21 days? In which conditions breeders have been reared (dimensions of floor pens? Feed characteristics? Environment?) Technical equipment It looks like incubators are different! This is not clear in the title. Is the incubator a factor? For the one which is industrially manufactured, state the name of the company. The incubator has different capacity. In the present study, how many eggs each incubator contains? Are the incubators automatic?</p> <p>Methods "After weighing, they were classified into three categories: Small (35 to 45g), Medium (46 to 55g) and Large (56 to 65g)" complete the sentence with "for each strain" Then, they were stored in the breeding building in a fence to protect them from predators: At which temperature? For how many days? "Incubations were carried out in the mornings. On the eighteenth day of incubation, a mirage was made." Correct this into "Incubations were checked in the mornings. On d 18 of incubation, eggs were candled." Please check the english in the whole manuscript What is the normal incubation temperature? Relative humidity? What is the frequency of egg turning? The incubation conditions were not controlled, and this could have an effect on the results. Variations in incubation conditions, prolonged storage duration, and differences between the incubators used may lead to the conclusion that the results obtained are not due to the size of the eggs but to several uncontrolled factors. In this study, it seems that there are three factors (the chicken stains, the egg size, and the incubators), so the statistical test used is not appropriate. ANOVA should be the more appropriate test. The data analyses should be redone considering the different factors. Even if it was the egg size, given that there are three categories, the authors cannot use the t-test, which is used to compare only two groups.</p> <p>Results and Discussion There is no important differences between figure 1 and Table 1. Repeated results</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>“Table 2, below, presents the brooding parameters depending on the strains. The Kuroiler strain recorded the highest fertility rate (90.91%) compared to that of Chair Roux (90.87%).” I'm not sure that, there is a difference between these two values! Can authors state the p value? The results presented in this form are not scientifically accepted It looks like, values given in the table 2 were not analyzed! Authors needs to state the p value and standard errors. The 2-way anova test should be applied here (table 2) as authors is showing the effect of strain and egg size which means 2 factors. So, the data of these parameters should be redone. Table 3: what is intra shell mortality rate of chicks? Apparent hatching rate? Actual hatching rate? Clear eggs? Use conventional words in incubation practice (early or late embryonic mortality? Fertile or total hatchability?) If data are analyzed, please give the standard error and p values! Eggs wasn't incubated randomly in the incubator? Table 4 should be redone: Authors need to present the effect of strain, effect of incubator, and their interaction (for statistical analyses, instead of using a 3-way anova, authors can use a 2 way anova). Please, give also the standard error and p value. (results presented in this table in this form are not scientifically accepted) Discussion The discussion section should be rewritten: avoid the repetition of the results Conclusion The conclusion concern only the size of eggs. What about the incubators and the strain as the were tested and results were given according to these factors.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Bilalissi Abidi
Department, University & Country	Togolese Institute of Agronomic Research, Togo