

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_97228
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Substitution of Sorghum Grain by Teff (Eragrostis tef) Grain on the Performance of Broiler Chicks
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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>1. The manuscript proposes an alternative to Sorghum grain that based on the authors' opinion should be replaced by Teff (<i>Eragrostis tef</i>) grain in poultry. The scientific evidence provided in this manuscript is limited to one <i>in vivo</i> study with basic evaluation such as feed intake (FI), body weight gain (BWG), feed conversion ratio (FCR), carcass weight (CW), weight of internal organs (liver, gizzard, pancreas, neck and heart), and serum contents (cholesterol, glucose and triglyceride). Thus, the study could be relevant for poultry science and agriculture domain, but more data are needed to propose this alternative.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable based on the presented content, but the authors should correct the English language and the common names for the suggested crops (capital letters)</p> <p>3. The abstract requires revisions – to reduce the details of methodology, to add more results and conclusions that are supported by the results</p> <p>4. The overall quality of the presentation is poor, scientific style should be improved for all manuscript sections.</p> <p>The introduction – this part should be removed! <i>“The global dominance of the four crops, maize, wheat, rice, and sorghum in the current food system has raised an alarm. Heavy dependence on these crops can limit the capacity to deal with food shortages and dietary imbalance. The poultry industry has suffered more than any other livestock industry as a result of inadequate supply and high cost of feed ([1], [2], [3]) and feed cost is expected to continue in the upward swing [4]. Cereal grains constitute the major sources of energy in poultry diets in the tropics [5]. 51 % of sorghum crop is used to feed livestock while 49% is for human food and other uses [6]. This aggressive competition between livestock and humans requires a serious diversification of energy feedstuff for livestock.”</i></p> <p>The authors should objectively present the importance of feed types in poultry industry and justify the role of certain crops Also, to add the potential local value of the proposed crop. The material and methods – an ethical statement should be added since live animals were used for this study Could the authors justify the use of Near-infrared microscopy (NIR) ? Discussion section should be added Conclusions are not supported by the results</p> <p>5. The manuscript is not entirely accurate, in particular the introduction and the conclusion</p> <p>6. Too many dated references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English language requires corrections – several sentences to not have verbs or connections	
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:	Niculae Mihaela
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania