

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_119427
Title of the Manuscript:	MULBERRY LEAF POWDER AS PROTEIN ALTERNATIVE FOR POULTRY- A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community because mulberry leaf can be considered as a possible source of nutrition for poultry, in a situation where demand for poultry meat and eggs is growing. As traditional feedstocks are increasingly used in the biofuel industry, finding new feed resources is a topical challenge for animal husbandry in general and poultry in particular. The present review is welcome in order to draw attention to what has been studied worldwide on the use of mulberry leaf in poultry feed, namely broiler chicks and laying hens. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article well done and it is comprehensive. 4. Yes, the structure and subsection of the manuscript are appropriate for a review article. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct, but it has many editing mistakes. Some of them I have identified but I ask the author(s) to review the whole article to identify other mistakes in the text. 6. The references are relatively sufficient for a review article (40). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have made some corrections on the review article with the red colour. From my point of view, the review article can be published after this minor corrections.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Mihai- Iacob Bentea
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Cluj-Napoca, Romania