

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_99250
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GROWTH, CARCASS QUALITY, AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF GUINEA FOWL KEETS FED VARIOUS PERCENTAGES OF RAW JACKFRUIT SEEDMEAL (<i>Artocarpus heterophyllus</i>)
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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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)
<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>Yes. The research work is important for scientific community well as for farmers.</p> <p>Corrections are marked in the corrected manuscript.</p> <p>Corrections are marked in the corrected manuscript.</p> <p>Need revision as marked in the corrected manuscript.</p> <p>Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>Yes, its OK</p> <p>1. The comment "Though no approval number was assignedthis experiment was reviewed and approved by the Department of Animal Welfare Committee," must be clarified.</p> <p>2. Photographs 1, 2, 3 and 4 do not have any scientific relevance because these are usual methods.</p> <p>3. Sample size for carcass evaluation is too small as only one bird was taken from each replicate. The findings generated will have little significance because of biological variations.</p> <p>4. The language needs revision.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>5. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1, The language and Grammer needs revision. Some suggestions are marked in the revised manuscript.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajesh Kumar Joshi
Department, University & Country	College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, India