

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_100565
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of early dietary interventions on energy expenditure and nutrient oxidation in newborn intra-uterine restricted piglets: A pilot study
Type of the Article	Method 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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Undoubtedly the topic of this manuscript is really interesting and has the potential to be extremely important for scientific community. This investigation is quite remarkable, and the methodology design was well conceived with the use of scientific technology (i.e. respiratory chambers). As we know, pig producers face numerous challenges, so this kind of investigation can help them to adopt better producing practices. The investigation design was well conceived, but the main “negative aspect” is related with the reduced number of piglets per group, limiting the deepness of the conclusions achieved. However, this manuscript constitutes an extremely important starting point to evaluate the viability of intra-uterine growth restricted piglets.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is adequate.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is adequate, as it summarises the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections of the manuscript are adequate and its structure was really well conceived. In my opinion, the “2. MATERIAL AND METHODS” section should be further detailed. For example, it would be interesting if the anesthetic protocol could be detailed with the doses of each medication. Additionally, it would be interesting if the author could explain if it was performed some kind of analysis to compare the quality of colostrum samples.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct, but some little modifications must be made. When you use an acronym, you must write out the first in-text reference to an acronym, followed by the acronym itself written in capital letters and enclosed by parentheses. All the subsequent references to the acronym must be made just by the capital letters alone. Because of that, all the acronyms (i.e. ID, BW or IUGR) need to be preceded by the complete meaning and all the subsequent mentions must be made uniquely with the acronym itself. It is necessary to mention “Table 1”, “Table 2” and “Table 3” throughout the text of the manuscript. In my opinion, the anesthetic protocol should focus the active principles of each medication, so the sentence “...an i.m. injection of a Zoletil mix (Zoletil 50; Virbac, Kolding, Denmark)...” should be replaced by “...an i.m. injection of a zolazepam mix (Zoletil 50; Virbac, Kolding, Denmark)...”. The velocity of the centrifuge needs to be rewritten, since the sentence “Blood was then centrifuged at room temperature for 15 min at 1.20xg” is not clear.</p> <p>6. The number of references cited (24) is clearly adequate, however only one of the cited references was published in the past five years. The references pattern is not always the same, so it is necessary to correct that. For example, there are three references whose year of publication are not written in bold, differently from the rest of the references. Additionally, the DOI format is not written always in the same way. The citation “...described by Amdi et al., 2013” must be replaced by “...described by Amdi <i>et al.</i>, (2013)”. That cited article (Amdi et al., 2013 [2]) is not present in the references list. The reference number [2] is Theil <i>et al.</i> (2014) (instead of Amdi <i>et al.</i>, (2013)), so it is imperative to correct that mistake.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>1. Yes, the language is adequate for a scientific article. However I recommend that the whole</p>	

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	manuscript must be checked for some grammar and spelling mistakes. Additional suggestions: The sentence "Furthermore, given the very low level of blood glucose levels in..." should be modified, since there is an adequate repetition of the word "level". The sentence "...observed and can associated with..." should be replaced by "...observed and can be associated with...". The sentence "...has to the best of the author's knowledge not been investigated." should be replaced by "...has, to the best of the author's knowledge, not been investigated." The sentence "Blood glucose, rectal temperature and body weight was measured..." should be replaced by "Blood glucose, rectal temperature and body weight were measured...". The sentence "...remained for another 3h." should be replaced by sentence "...remained for another three hours." The sentence "...containing xylacin..." should be replaced by "...containing xylazine ...". The sentence "...if glucose and ketones bodies..." should be replaced by "...if glucose and ketone bodies...".	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pedro Miguel Cunha Caetano
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Évora, Portugal