

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_101619</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative performances of improved poultry varieties under backyard rearing system in Dhemaji district of Assam</b>
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>The manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community due to its contributions and findings in the field.</b></p> <p><b>Title is ok for this manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>The abstract should be clearer in presenting the methods, results, and conclusion.</b></p> <p><b>Should be improved.</b></p> <p><b>With the suggested corrections and revisions made based on the reviewer's comments, the manuscript will be scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>The references provided in the manuscript are not sufficient and may require additional recent sources to strengthen the discussion sections. I recommend the authors to enhance the reference list by incorporating more relevant and up-to-date literature. This will help provide a comprehensive foundation for the research and ensure that the discussion is adequately supported.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Minor spelling checks, grammar corrections, and consistency improvements would be warranted to enhance the language quality of the article for scholarly communications.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In some places, the names "Vanaraja," "Rainbow Rooster," and "Kamruapa" are written in italic form, while in others, they are written in normal form. Is there a specific reason for this variation?</li> <li>➤ The references used in the article body have inconsistent font sizes compared to the original body text. Additionally, the font size in the reference section is also inconsistent.</li> <li>➤ Page 1, L16: Rainbow Rooster 175.08 ±6.13n days (mean ± standard deviation). However, the meaning of the symbol "n" was not clearly explained. Could the authors kindly provide clarification on the intended use or definition of "n" in this context?</li> <li>➤ Page 2, 3, L39, 48, 74: The abbreviation "nos." is used, which may be unfamiliar to readers. Please write out the full word instead.</li> <li>➤ Page 1-2, L27-63: The spacing between lines appears to be inconsistent.</li> <li>➤ Page 2, L42: The font color appears to be different.</li> <li>➤ Page 3, L42: The applied statistical methods should be clearly mentioned, along with the appropriate software used.</li> <li>➤ Page 3-4, L91: The spacing between lines appears to be inconsistent. Could you please ensure a uniform line spacing throughout the document?</li> <li>➤ The font size appears to be inconsistent in the cells of Table 2.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ The units of measurement are sometimes expressed as "g" and sometimes as "gm" for indicating grams. Shouldn't it be consistent throughout the article?</li><li>➤ Page 6, L142: The lower values might ..... chicken of Assam. Is there any reference for validating the performance of indigenous chicken? Please provide an appropriate reference.</li><li>➤ The results presented in the manuscript need improvement.</li><li>➤ The discussion was just reporting and comparing with other previously published results, rather than trying to justify the results. Thus, the discussion needs improvement for publication.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Azizul Haque</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Life and Applied Sciences, Yeungnam University, South Korea</b>