

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_114856
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of vitamin D3 enrichment by ultra violet blue (UVB) radiation and dietary zinc supplementation on egg production and feed consumption in layer birds
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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. 2. Yes. 3. No. 1. The abstract does not provide sufficient background information to justify the study. It does not mention the rationale or the significance of investigating the influence of vitamin D3 enrichment and dietary zinc supplementation on egg production and feed consumption in layer birds. 2. The abstract does not provide a clear conclusion of the study's findings. It does not discuss the implications of the results or provide any suggestions for future research. 3. The keywords in the abstract is somewhat limited. While it includes relevant terms such as "Egg production" and "Feed consumption," it could benefit from additional keywords that reflect the specific interventions studied, such as "Vitamin D3 enrichment," "UVB radiation," and "Dietary zinc supplementation." 4. OK. 5. Yes. 6. OK. <p>Introduction section: weaknesses that need attention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of focused research question: The introduction does not clearly state the research question or objective of the study. While it mentions the production of vitamin D3 enriched eggs through UVB exposure and zinc-enriched eggs through dietary supplementation, it does not specify the specific research goals that will be addressed. 2. Insufficient background information: The introduction provides some general information about the nutritional value of eggs and the progress of poultry production in India. However, it lacks specific and relevant background information that would help readers understand the need for enriching the nutritional profile of poultry products. 3. Lack of citations: The introduction makes several statements without proper citations to support the claims made. For instance, it mentions that designer eggs have high market demand due to their nutritional qualities, but this statement is not backed up by any references or evidence. 4. The introduction does not provide a clear justification for conducting the current study. While it mentions increased consumer interest in the nutritional value of foods and the market demand for designer eggs, it does not explain why specifically enriching eggs with vitamin D3 and zinc is important or necessary. <p>Methodology section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The methodology does not provide a clear explanation of how the sample size of 64 birds was determined. It is important to justify the sample size used in the study to ensure it is adequate for detecting meaningful effects. 2. Lack of information on the standard layer diet: The methodology mentions that all birds were fed with a standard layer diet but does not provide specific details about the composition of the diet. It is crucial to describe the nutritional composition and ingredients of the diet to ensure the study's replicability and to understand the potential impact of the diet on the study outcomes. 3. Incomplete information on UVB exposure: Although the methodology mentions the UVB light exposure protocol, it lacks details on the duration and intensity of exposure. <p>Results & discussions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of statistical significance: The section mentions multiple times that the effects of UVB light treatment and zinc feeding were not statistically significant. However, it does not provide any p- 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>values or confidence intervals to support this claim.</p> <p>2. Lack of context: The section does not provide much context for the findings. It does not discuss the potential implications of the results or relate them to existing knowledge in the field. Providing a broader context would help readers understand the significance of the findings and their potential applications.</p> <p>3. Incomplete data presentation: The section refers to tables for presenting the data but does not include the actual tables in the critique. Without the tables, it is challenging to evaluate the data and assess the validity of the reported results.</p> <p>The conclusion is too shallow.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK.	
Optional/General comments	Please have a look at the manuscript in word track for grammar corrections.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kefelegn Kebede Kefenie
Department, University & Country	School of Animal & Range Sciences, Haramaya University, Hohenheim University, Ethiopia