

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_105559
Title of the Manuscript:	Selective Breeding Under a Hierarchical Mating using OSBORNE Index Web APP
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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/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>NO, This abstract does not touch on several aspects on egg production and its integration with modern technologies, but there are some points that need to be clarified for scientific accuracy. To enhance the scientific accuracy and clarity of the abstract, it is important to provide specific details, clear explanations and proper context is needed.</p> <p>Title can be modified like "Cultivating efficiency in egg production-leveraging the Osborne index web app for Hierarchical selective breeding</p> <p>While the abstract provides valuable insights into the integration of ICT into egg production technics, there are some potential areas are required for improvement – 1. Lack of contextualisation, 2. Unclear recommendations, 3. Vague language, 4. Limited explanation of web app, 5. Incomplete impact discussion, 6. Lack of novelty and grammar and clarity.</p> <p>Sub sections can be modified. There is no literature review</p> <p>No, For scientific accuracy a brief description of selective breeding and its relevance to egg production should be included. Authors should establish a logical flow and batter convey the scientific significance of the proposed approach.</p> <p>References are not sufficient</p> <p>1.lack of clarity in purpose and audience focus 2. In adequate justification for technologies 3. Unclear data interaction flow 4. Complexity in calculation explanation 5. Lack of visual aids 6. Inconsistence in terminology 7. Absence of user experience consideration</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are few grammatical and structural issues that could be addressed to improve the overall clarity and readability of the manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are several grammar and syntax: There are several grammatical errors and awkward sentence structured</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramesh Redrouthu
Department, University & Country	Adama Science and Technology University, Ethiopia