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| Page No. | COMMENT | RESPONSE |
| 1. | Which is better: cassava root or cassava leaf meal? | The statement has been updated to specify the distinctive relevance of cassava roots and leaf.  When properly processed, cassava root meal can replace maize (as an energy source), and cassava leaf meal can partially replace soybean meal (as a protein source) in livestock diets — particularly for broilers and fish. |
|  | Why did you mention this in your recommendation? In fact, you didn’t mention it before, not even in your method. | Statement has been updated to explain reviewer’s observation. “Fish meal is a common ingredient in all the treatments and has been indicated in the body of work as FM which has now been explained. |
| 1 | Why is the second group 26 instead of 25, as in the first group? | In commercial poultry marketing, it is a standard practice for a carton of 50 day-old chicks to contain 51 chicks to account for potential early mortality. Consequently, the extra chick could not be excluded without deviating from established procedures and was therefore assigned to one of the treatment groups. This slight variation in the number of chicks per group did not affect the experimental process or compromise the integrity of the results. |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | Can you clarify what you mean by treatment A being 50% for 4 treatment, which totals 200%? | We appreciate the reviewer’s observation. The use of '50%' for multiple ingredients in the description of Treatment A were not intended to be additive across ingredients. It was not intended to imply that the percentages should be summed to 200%. Rather, each ingredient (cassava root meal, cassava leaf meal, maize, and fresh soybean) contributed equally to the composition of the feed mixture used in Treatment A, based on their proportions relative to the total feed formulation.  We acknowledge the confusion and have revised the description for clarity to reflect that the ingredients were mixed in equal parts by weight, not that each made up 50% of the whole. “In Treatment A, the feed was formulated by mixing cassava root meal, cassava leaf meal, maize, and fresh soybean in equal proportions, whereas Treatment B comprised only cassava root meal and cassava leaf meal (both at 100%). After the eight-week experimental period, Treatment B (birds fed solely on cassava-based feed) exhibited a lower mortality rate (3 birds) compared to Treatment A (17 birds)”. |
| 1 | where one pen contained nine chicks, and the second pen contained ten chicks. - What is the reason for the difference between one group being classified as nine and another as ten? | This has been rephrased and missing lines and figures indicated accordingly. “The house was divided into 2 Pens to accommodate a total of 51 chicks used for the experiment, where one pen contained twenty five chicks, and the second pen contained twenty six chicks. “ |
| 8 | How do you calculate this presentation? The total is 200%, not 100%. Please clarify.  - “fed 50% cassava tuber, 50% fresh soya bean, 50% maize meal, 50% leaf meal” | Paragraph has been updated to further clarify as noted by the Reviewer. The use of '50%' for multiple ingredients in the description of Treatment A were not intended to be additive across ingredients. It was not intended to imply that the percentages should be summed to 200%. Rather, each ingredient (cassava root meal, cassava leaf meal, maize, and fresh soybean) contributed equally to the composition of the feed mixture used in Treatment A, based on their proportions relative to the total feed formulation. |
| 8 | TI ? | (TI) has been explained in the text as trypsin inhibitors |
| 11 | What kind of negative effects or what content do cassava leaves have that have a negative impact on chick feed? (Page 10). | This has been updated with ‘Cassava leaves are protein-rich but contain anti-nutritional factors like cyanogenic glycosides and high crude fiber content reduces digestibility, in chicks. Hence, proper processing is essential to reduce toxicity and improve digestibility (Ogbuewu & Mbajiorgu, 2023)’. |
| 11 | “Isn’t this the opposite? Please double-check it.” | Treatment letters have corrected accordingly |
| 7 | How can you “properly detoxify” | Sentence has been updated to read “Proper detoxification involves a chain of process including; peeling, soaking/fermentation, cooking, and drying. |
| 10 | CSV. ASH: ; NFE in Table 2 | All highlighted abbreviations in have been described. |
| 12 | Your conclusion is too lengthy. It is more appropriate for an introduction. Pg. 12 | Conclusion has be reduced accordingly as suggested. |
| 12 | Your conclusion is too lengthy and is more suited for a discussion. Instead, you should briefly mention the purpose or objective of your study, highlight the key findings, and draw implications. Provide recommendations, acknowledge any limitations, and suggest directions for future research. Finally, conclude with the impact of your work. Pg.12 | Conclusion has been reduced as suggested. |
|  | General comment and suggested corrections in comment boxes | All highlighted comments have treated and all uncommon abbreviations have been described. |
|  | References | DOI has been provided to all references as applicable |