



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_54482
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF NON-LINEAR GROWTH CURVE MODELS IN NON DESCRIPT CALIFORNIA AND NEW ZEALAND RABBITS REARED IN THE TROPICAL CONDITIONS OF NIGERIA
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Experimental data collection must be better described, for example: How old were the animals at the beginning and at the end of the experiment? It is very important to know the initial body weight of the animals? All of them have the same body weight? What was the standard deviation of the bodyweight? How long was the experiment? 2) Which age can these models be applied? 3) Do these models already exist or did you develop them? It is not clear to me Because, usually it is used R2, RMSE, AIC etc to validate a new proposed model. In this case, if you only tested existing models, you do not need to validate them. What was the reason to evaluate theses criteria? 4) How many data did you have? Did you test all the models with 100% of the data? 5) Table 1: What are "a", "b", "c" and "d"???? It must be explained. How were "a", "b", "c" and "d" obtained? What are the differences of the models? Please add in the text. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Experimental data collection must be better described. This is a very important part of the paper. 2) I suggest to explore more the results related to the comparison of body weight gain, the breeds, the age and etc. Maybe the authors could work on longitudinal analysis. The models are very interesting but they have already existed. The contribution of the paper is the results obtained WITH the models, that should be more discussed. And it is not well explored in this paper. 	

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?	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Verify the country's laws and the need for the Ethics Committee's approval certificate for animal experimentation.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Patrícia Ferreira Ponciano Ferraz</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal University of Lavras, Brazil</i>