

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_128112
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Broiler Meat Quality using Abattoir Waste as Protein
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>

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.	This manuscript provides critical insights into the potential of utilizing abattoir waste as an alternative protein source in broiler feed, addressing a significant challenge in sustainable livestock production. By evaluating its effects on meat quality, including protein content, palatability, and microbial safety, the study highlights its feasibility for cost-effective and environmentally friendly poultry production. The findings contribute to the growing body of research on circular agriculture, where waste products are repurposed to reduce reliance on conventional feed ingredients. This research is particularly relevant for regions seeking affordable, locally available feed solutions without compromising meat quality or safety.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Evaluating the Impact of Abattoir Waste as an Alternative Protein Source on Broiler Meat Quality"	
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 of the article is well-written and provides an informative summary of the study, including its objective, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. However, it can be further improved for clarity and impact. First, the aim and scope could be expanded to emphasize the broader significance of the research, such as its relevance to sustainable poultry production. For example, the abstract could highlight that the study addresses the potential of abattoir waste as a sustainable and cost-effective protein source. Additionally, while the key findings are mentioned, they could be elaborated to specify what "best quality" entails, such as higher protein content, improved palatability, or economic benefits. Including a brief statement about the limitations or implications of the study, such as the need for further research on long-term health effects or economic feasibility, would provide a balanced perspective. The detailed description of experimental treatments could also be slightly condensed to make room for a more robust discussion of findings and implications. These changes would enhance the abstract's comprehensiveness, ensuring it effectively conveys the study's significance to the scientific community.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the content provided in the manuscript, the study appears to be scientifically sound, with appropriate methodologies and a clear focus on evaluating the impact of abattoir waste as an alternative protein source for broiler chickens. The experimental design, including the use of different dietary treatments with varying levels of abattoir waste, is a logical approach to assessing the potential of this protein source. The manuscript correctly uses statistical methods, such as ANOVA and the Tukey test, to analyze the data and draw conclusions. The analysis of key factors like proximate composition, microbial load, cholesterol levels, and palatability is relevant and aligns with industry standards for evaluating meat quality. The inclusion of controls and replicates in the experiment strengthens the validity of the findings. However, while the manuscript is scientifically correct, it would benefit from a clearer explanation of certain points, such as the specific mechanisms by which abattoir waste influences meat quality, and further discussion of the long-term implications for poultry health and sustainability. Additionally, the references to existing literature are appropriate, but more comparisons to other studies could enhance the context and relevance of the findings. In summary, the manuscript is scientifically correct and offers valuable insights into the use of abattoir waste in poultry feed. Further exploration of its broader applications and long-term effects would make the findings even more robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are relevant and sufficient for the scope of the study, particularly regarding the evaluation of dietary treatments on broiler meat quality. However, there are areas where additional, more recent references could strengthen the manuscript and provide broader context for the findings. For example, it would be valuable to include studies on sustainable feed sources and	

Review Form 3

	waste management in poultry production, which could help contextualize the environmental and economic benefits of using abattoir waste. Additionally, more recent reviews on alternative protein sources, including the use of by-products like abattoir waste, could provide a comparative perspective on the benefits and challenges of using such materials. Another area that could be expanded is microbial safety and meat quality, including references on emerging risks and mitigation strategies in poultry meat, especially when using alternative feed sources. Furthermore, incorporating more recent studies on proximate composition and meat quality, specifically regarding the effects of different feed ingredients, could provide a more comprehensive view of the results. While the manuscript already cites important studies, including more recent references from the past five years in areas such as alternative proteins, sustainable poultry production, and microbial safety of meat would enhance the manuscript and demonstrate how it aligns with current research trends.	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication; however, there are areas that could be improved for clarity, coherence, and overall readability. While the technical terms and research methodologies are appropriately used, certain sections would benefit from a more refined structure, sentence flow, and punctuation to ensure better understanding and engagement for the academic audience. Some sentences are lengthy and could be broken into shorter, more digestible parts to improve readability. Shorter sentences with clearer transitions would enhance the overall flow of information. Consistency in terminology is important, and key terms like "abattoir waste" should be used consistently throughout the manuscript to avoid confusion. While the manuscript is understandable, attention to small grammatical issues, such as subject-verb agreement and punctuation, would strengthen the writing. Additionally, some sections could be adjusted for a more consistent academic tone by avoiding overly casual phrases or unnecessary repetition. Acronyms like "ANOVA" and "SAS" should be defined upon first use, particularly for readers who may not be familiar with specific statistical tools. Overall, the article is suitable for scholarly communication, but with refinements in sentence structure, clarity, and consistency, the language could be further enhanced to meet the high standards expected in academic publishing. A careful proofreading or professional editing would be beneficial to polish the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Julia Marixara Sousa Da Silva</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universidade Federal De Goias-UFG, Brasil</p>