

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_JABB_117937</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EVALUATION OF QUALITY PARAMETERS OF INDIVIDUAL AND POOLED RAW SEMEN IN PEARL GUINEA FOWLS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes. It is important to maintain (and increase) pearl guinea fowls population as it is considered as a good practise for pest control. To do this , it is crucial to determine semen quality.</p> <p>Title is suitable and relay the point of the article.</p> <p>Yes, however, appreciate if author can also report normal range of a good quality semen for pearl guinea fowls or of its similar kind.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Appreciate if the author can cite latest references. Of 31 references, only 4 references are within 10 years and less.</p> <p>Additional comments:  a) Normal range of good semen quality to be stated in the article.  b) If possible, can the author state of all individual studied, which individual produced the best semen quality?  c) In Introduction:  (i) "However, optimal fertility through artificial</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>insemination necessitates the insemination of quality spermatozoa “ require reference.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide 5W1H. For example, Introduce the animal first, state why the topic important, state the different opinion about this topic, and describe why author research is important to help.</p> <p><b>d) In Materials and Methods:</b></p> <p>(i) Please state the indicator of character in detail in “on their phenotypic characteristics and housed individually in cages”</p> <p>(ii) Reference is needed for “After a week-long acclimatization period, the birds were trained for semen collection by abdominal massage technique”</p> <p>(iii) For “The same slides stained for the assessment of live and dead spermatozoa were used for abnormal spermatozoa and a maximum of 200 spermatozoa were counted and expressed in percentage .”, Please add how the data are calculated.</p> <p><b>e) In Results and Discussion:</b></p> <p>(i) Reference is needed for “place of the study, time of semen collection and difference in genetic makeup of the birds.”</p> <p>(ii) Please provide more explanation on “contaminated with blood or droppings / urates debris was not used for analysis “</p> <p>(iii) As that for percent live spermatozoa, appreciate if the author can give statement if having high parameter value indicate the semen is of better quality.</p> <p><b>f) Table 1, to amend “n=6” to “n=16”</b></p>	
--	---	--

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Usage of English is good and understandable. However:  1) Preferably, first sentence ("From...") in Introduction Section to be improved	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good to proceed with publishing after minor amendments as stated above (upon jurisdiction from author if the comments are relevant)	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dk Nurul Kahrani Pg Hj Ishak</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brunei</b>