

Paper: “Incorporation of a Non-Conventional Liana (*Tetracapidium conophorum*) Seed Oil Cake in Diets of Congolese Indigenous Batéké Chicks Raised Without Outdoor Access”

Submitted: 07 May 2024

Accepted: 25 August 2024

Published: 31 August 2024

Corresponding Author: Henri Banga-Mboko

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n24p67

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kolawole Odubote
University of Zambia, Zambia

Reviewer 2: Salimata Ouattara
University of Lomé, Togo

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr Idowu Kolawole Odubote	
University/Country: University of Zambia/Zambia	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/05/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/05/2024
Manuscript Title: INCORPORATION OF A NON-CONVENTIONAL LIANA <i>TETRACAPIDIUM CONOPHORUM</i> SEED OIL CAKE IN BASED - DIETS OF INDIGENOUS <i>BATÉKÉ</i> CHICKS RAISED IN CLOSE CONFINEMENT IN CONGO	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
The title is not clear and will require modification.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
The abstract did not expressly present the objects, method and the results obtained. It also contained some technical errors	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2

There were a high number of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in addition to incomplete sentences and use of punctuations	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The study methods were not clearly explained. The number of birds used was stated to be 66 and in another section was given as 96. There was also a discrepancy in the number of replicates. The diets fed were different for not only the TC levels but also for almost all the feed ingredients. Thus, it was not clear what was responsible for the differences obtained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
The results were not clearly presented	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
The conclusion drawn were not only too basic but superfluous especially on genetic selection as this was not supported by the results obtained.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references appears to be comprehensive.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper should be revisited for the errors it contained, especially on the design of the experiment.

The grammar should also be checked

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: