

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	- The study unearths the performance and behavioural attributes of an exotic pig breed in a foreign environment. This is important for researchers intending to use the breed outside the original environment	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Please delete the word "increasing" from the title	
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 section is quite informative. However, the arrangement of the sections needs to be revised. For example, study design and place and duration of the study are all under methodology	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript has scientific significance. However, the author(s) need to improve the introduction section- there is a mix of words (for example, the authors mentioned that space allowance and stocking density are used interchangeably which is actually wrong). In addition, there is a weak justification for carrying out the study. This should come out clearly in the introduction section. The introduction is also weak, owing to the neglect in using literature- thus, it is almost plainly written. The authors should revise it!	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are sufficient. However, intext citations need to be formatted according to the journal's guidelines	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are grammatical errors, for example, the author(s) used the word "feet" even when the unit was 1 (1 feet). This should be changed to "1 foot" all through the document	
Optional/General comments	The study reports on an important subject. However, I would recommend that is is published as a short communication given the narrow scope of the study.	

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:	Junior Senyonga Kasima
Department, University & Country	Gulu University, Uganda