

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127618
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of increasing stocking density on the Welfare of Growing Large White Yorkshire Pigs
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript " <i>Effect of Increasing Stocking Density on the Welfare of Growing Large White Yorkshire Pigs</i> " holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of animal husbandry and welfare science. By exploring the relationship between stocking density and welfare parameters, this study provides critical insights into optimizing management practices for improved animal health, behavior, and productivity. Such findings contribute to the development of evidence-based policies and guidelines that promote sustainable and ethical livestock farming.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title " <i>Effect of Increasing Stocking Density on the Welfare of Growing Large White Yorkshire Pigs</i> " is clear and descriptive if it is changed, it is better, I have recommended it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Impact of Stocking Density on Welfare, Behavior, and Growth Performance of Large White Yorkshire Pigs" "Evaluating the Effects of Stocking Density on Welfare and Productivity in Large White Yorkshire Pigs" "Behavioral and Welfare Impacts of Stocking Density in Growing Large White Yorkshire Pigs" 	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured, clearly presenting the aim, methodology, results, and conclusion of the study. However, some refinements can enhance clarity and completeness.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript " <i>Effect of Increasing Stocking Density on the Welfare of Growing Large White Yorkshire Pigs</i> " appears to be scientifically correct, as it is based on a clear research hypothesis that aligns with established principles in animal welfare and livestock management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	All references should be done in APA style and references should be entered through endnotes	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article contained several English Grammar mistakes that needed correction.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper addresses a current idea and issue, regarding Effect of increasing stocking density on the Welfare of Growing Large White Yorkshire Pigs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction section can be improved if these steps are followed Background of the study Impacts Existing Review Importance of study Gap as well as Objective of the study. 2. The study is quite interesting but requires some extensive improvements. 3. English language should be revised considerably, in order to be appropriate for publication in a scientific journal. 4. The manuscript requires major improvements, both from a conceptual and scientific standpoint. 5. The conclusions are too general. They should be more to-the-point, in relation with the current study. 6. There are many studies available related to this, please mention how your study is different. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Asma Khan Kakar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Balochistan, Pakistan</p>