

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_117937
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF QUALITY PARAMETERS OF INDIVIDUAL AND POOLED RAW SEMEN IN PEARL GUINEA FOWLS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<p>I appreciate your efforts in conducting this research. However, I have several clarifications that need to be addressed. The objectives and the hypothesis of this study seem vague. No interventions were conducted that could potentially affect semen quality, so what results do you expect? While it is already reported that semen collected from multiple males (pooled semen) could potentially improve fertility rates, your findings do not appear to be statistically significant. Moreover, your methods did not mention that the data was statistically analyzed to consider the findings scientifically correct.</p> <p>A more detailed description of the semen colour and consistency is required. How do you assess consistency (e.g., moderate and thick)? It is also suggested that the feed composition of the guinea fowls be presented in tabular form in the methods section.</p> <p>I believe presenting individual data for the birds is unnecessary, and that overall means values would suffice. However, if only the overall mean data were presented, the presentation would not meet the standards for an original research article.</p> <p>This study could have been improved by including interventions that could affect semen quality, such as raising birds in different environmental conditions (e.g., heat stress), feeding them different diets, and considering age, among other factors.</p> <p>Please proofread your work and ensure all references cited in the text are listed in the references section. Furthermore, ensure all claims in the introduction and methodology are properly cited.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English language is fine but could be improved with some language editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Keiven Mark B. Ampode
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Sultan Kudarat State University, Philippines