

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_105173
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of substituting sunflower seed cake with copra cake on growth performance and economic value of broiler
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Certainly, the significance of this manuscript resonates strongly within the scientific community. In the current context, achieving accelerated growth rates within specified timeframes necessitates a meticulously balanced poultry diet. However, that the feed formulation remains economically viable, as the cost of feed substantially factors into profitability considerations. Hence, the potential substitution of pricey constituents with more cost-effective alternatives with minimizing deviations in the fundamental nutritional composition of the feed, will substantially influence the financial gains derived from broiler farming.</li> <li>2. Title is highly appropriate.</li> <li>3. Indeed, Abstract of the manuscript provides a comprehensive overview.</li> <li>4. Yes, Sub sections are appropriate and rightly placed in the manuscript.</li> <li>5. Certainly, the manuscript possesses the scientific accuracy.</li> <li>6. References are adequate; the inclusion of more recent sources could further bolster the experiment's findings.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Language quality in the article is well suited for scholarly communication</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Authors can make it concise as it tends to become lengthy at some point. Like some section from introduction might be trimmed. It's not necessary everywhere to include key notes for describe every treatment beneath the tables. While calculating BCR, authors can add all input cost for showing clear picture of overall profit. Additionally, omitting subsections 3.1 and 3.2 along with Table 2 from the results section seems reasonable since detailed presentation of every ingredient's nutritional value doesn't significantly impact the outcomes.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Rohit Gupta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Punjab Agricultural University, India</b>