

## Reviewers Guide

### PART A: Editorial Office Only

#### SECTION I

Reviewer's Name:	Snezana Bogosavljevic-Boskovic
E-Mail:	sbb@tfc.kg.ac.rs
Manuscript Number:	AJB-11-212
Title:	
Authors:	
Date Sent To Reviewer:	03-05-2011
Date Expected From Reviewer:	17-05-2011

### PART B: Reviewer Only

#### SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment:	<p>The manuscript must be rewritten by a native English speaker. There are many grammatical and spelling errors and awkward sentences.</p> <p>The manuscript is technically poorly written. Journal instructions have not been satisfied. The methodology used is inadequate, and in some segments not sufficiently explained. There is no analysis of the statistical significance of differences obtained in different experimental groups.</p> <p>The manuscript has no value that would justify its publication in this journal.</p>
Introduction:	<p>The Abstract does not provide sufficient information as to the subject matter and objective of the manuscript or conclusions drawn.</p> <p>In the Introduction section, inadequate terms are used (e.g. poultry keeping), the literature is not adequately cited (according to the journal instructions). Certain data are inadequately used (e.g. the amount of Se cannot be represented by simply summing its content in water and food ( 0,060 +/-0,007 (in the food: 0,052+/- 0,006 mg/kg; in the water: 0,008+/-0,001 mg/l).</p> <p>No data source as to the amount of Se in other countries is</p>

	<p>reported; nor do the authors mention the optimal Se level recommended in the literature. The only information provided is that the level is not sufficient in the Tabric region.</p>
Methodology:	<p>The methodology used is not given in sufficient detail (Consumption on selenium by means of feed, using it in the chicken organism and its balance was studied according to generally accepted methods- this should be explained in detail) and is not adequate in some segments.</p> <p>Two experimental groups that are mentioned later on in the Results section are not included in the Materials and Methods section (the groups receiving 0.15 and 0.25 mg/kg Se).</p> <p>Some samples (e.g. the number of eggs used to determine weight) are too small to be interpreted and used for adequate conclusions.</p> <p>For most parameters, there is no analysis of the statistical significance of differences between experimental groups. Without this analysis no conclusions can be drawn on the effect of treatments on experimental groups.</p>
Results:	<p>The tables do not provide results of analysis of statistical significance. Tables providing data on egg production, egg-laying capacity, egg weight, and survival are missing.</p> <p>The data on circle egg laying are not in agreement with the data on the egg-laying capacity (egg yield).</p>
Discussion:	<p>The results obtained are not compared with the results of other authors who dealt with the similar subject. No literature data are provided in this section, which is impermissible.</p>

## SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References:	The references must be correctly provided, in accordance with the journal guidelines, especially the journal titles. The font size and other items of headings and text sections are different from the instructions for authors of the journal.
Others:	
Decision:	The recommendation is as follows: the manuscript should be rewritten by a native English speaker; any possible corrections should be made and the manuscript should be submitted to another related journal. I can hardly recommend the acceptance of this manuscript even after major revision.

**SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)**

Originality:	4
Contribution To The Field:	4
Technical Quality:	4
Clarity Of Presentation :	4
Depth Of Research:	4

**SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)**

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):	<p>The manuscript should not be accepted for publication in this journal because it lacks some of the important elements of a scientific paper.</p> <p>I recommend that this manuscript be rewritten and corrected (with additional requirements included) and submitted to another journal.</p>

## **SECTION V: Additional Comments**

Please add any additional comments including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any: