

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_97972
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS AND COST BENEFIT OF LOW AND HIGH PROTEIN LEVELS IN SNAIL DIETS WITH CONSTANT LEVELS OF ENERGY AND CALCIUM
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.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript has its novelty in term of malacology study.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract not comprehensive and need improvement.</p> <p>4. Subsection and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>5. Manuscript scientifically correct but need more improvement.</p> <p>6. Reference not enough, and need to used latest reference.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality is suitable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comments: Please refer to the manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Abstract should consists introduction, objective, methodology, result, discussion and conclusion</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction not supported by reference. There is no study objective. <p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What type of experimental design used in the study. What is type of chemical position that analyse in this study. <p>Result and Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reference used missing in the reference section. Reference used is to old. Lack of reference to support the discussion. <p>Reference</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of the comments not cited in the text. Reference not follow the standard reference format. 	

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:	Hadi Hamli
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia