

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_97901
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic and Genetic Parameter Estimates for Growth Traits in Local Guinea Fowl. Genetic and phenotypic correlations.
Type of the 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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This article is one of the few scientific studies on genetic and phenotypic relationship between guinea fowl growth characteristics. The obtained data bring new values to the use of the state of knowledge in this topic. In female guinea fowl, the values of genetic and phenotypic correlations between growth and reproductive characteristics were also given. The title of the manuscript is hard to understand and requires correction. Abstract is comprehensive but contains errors. The description of the test results requires a thorough correction. In many places it is inconsistent with the data contained in the tables. References are well chosen but journal abbreviation name is required for all items.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article requires a critical review in terms of the correctness of the English language. There are typographical errors, for example "gunea" instead of "guinea", see page 2</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are lots of errors in the article. It needs a thorough correction. Page 1 Abstract, L2 or just growth traits, see females; L17 (-0.23) not (0.23); L18 (-0.12) not (0.12) Page 2 L6,8,9 Guinea not gunea Page 3 In table 2 Fertility (%), Hatchability (%) instead of current form Results L2-5: In males , hatch weight (HWT) was highly correlated genetically with FMWT (0.56), FMWTG (0.54), SMWTG (0.64) but was lowly correlated with EMWT (0.18) and EMWTG (0.21). It correlated negatively low with EMWT (-0.17)...; L6 FMWT (-0.003) not (-0.01); L11 FMWT (-0.26) in Table 4 (not -9.26); L13-14 the description does not comply with Table 3; L16 (0.73 not 0.75) Page 6 L5 EMWT in females; L6 EMWT in males; L8 EMWT (0.39) not 0.26; L7 SMWT and EMWT no data in table 5 L9 rg = 1.2??, above 1.2; HWT and HWT =1.0? Table 3 Rg -3.73, -1.81, -2.65, 1.54, 1.02, -2.52? are these the correct values? rg TMWT and TMWT = 0.33? Table 4 title Dam-slaughter regression? Or Sire and Dam see L2, results chapter; HWT and FMWTG -9.26 or -0.26? I suggest in table 5 to place rg and rp data between rg and rp growth traits and reproductive traits In the section References abbreviated name journals according to ISO4 should be for all items. Is quoting [19]... correct? I suggest Nayak et al. [19]</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dariusz Kokoszyński
Department, University & Country	Bydgoszcz University of Science and Technology, Poland