

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_125350
Title of the Manuscript:	Technical Options for Body Weight Estimation: Prediction of Body Weights of Indigenous Sheep Populations from their Linear Body Measurements
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Farmers can effectively manage their livestock by accurately estimating body weight through linear measurements. Selecting superior breeding stock is facilitated by understanding the relationship between body weight and linear measurements. Valuable data for researchers studying growth patterns and health indicators in sheep is provided by the correlation between body measurements and weight.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes except for corrections made. See comments attached in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Because the manuscript stated clearly the scientific message, the methodology was clearly spelt out and presented as well as the conclusion except for corrections made.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not really. The authors can add recent references	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Need minor adjustment. See comments in the manuscript	

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:	Iliya Mallam
Department, University & Country	Kaduna State University, Nigeria