

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_98482
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of sperm quality of greater cane rat (<i>Thryonomys swinderianus</i>) collected by masturbation and epididymal puncture, in Ivory Coast
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:

(<https://www.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/editorial-policy>)

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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language need to be edited and revised Correct and revise the spellings	
Optional/General comments	Follow journal guidelines	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Radu Daniela
Department, University & Country	Fish Culture Research and Development Station, Romania