

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_124916
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH, NUTRIENTS DIGESTIBILITY AND ECONOMIC RESPONSE OF FIVE BROILER STRAINS FED COMMON DIET
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript presents significant value to the scientific community, particularly within poultry farming and nutrition research. It contributes valuable data on the growth, feed efficiency, and economic viability of various broiler strains under common dietary conditions. By comparing the performance of strains like Cobb 500, Arbor Acres, Ross 308, Hubbard Classic, and Marshall, it offers actionable insights for poultry farmers seeking to optimize feed costs and production outcomes. I appreciate this manuscript for its methodical approach and practical relevance, though it might benefit from more clarity in presenting statistical outcomes to enhance its accessibility.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title of the manuscript, "Growth Nutrients Digestibility and Economic Response of Five Broiler Strains Fed Common Diet," is informative but could benefit from a more concise and structured wording. It might also need better clarity regarding the main focus of the study, such as the comparative performance of broiler strains.</p> <p>An alternative title could be: "Comparative Growth Performance, Nutrient Digestibility, and Economic Efficiency of Five Broiler Strains Fed a Common Diet."</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the manuscript is generally comprehensive, as it outlines the key aspects of the study, including the experimental design, results, and conclusion.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript generally follow a standard research format, which is appropriate for a scientific study.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-structured experimental design and thorough data collection. The use of a completely randomized design (CRD) with replicates for each broiler strain ensures that the study minimizes bias and improves the reliability of the results. The parameters measured growth performance, nutrient digestibility, and economic efficiency are relevant to the objectives and are presented with clear statistical analyses (e.g., P-values), lending credibility to the findings. Furthermore, the use of established methods for digestibility and economic evaluation demonstrates technical rigor, making the study's conclusions both valid and applicable to real-world poultry farming.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript cover relevant topics, including broiler strains, growth performance, feed conversion, and digestibility. However, some of the sources, particularly those related to poultry farming practices and genetics, could be more recent. A few of the key references are relatively older (e.g., from 1997 or 2002), which may not reflect the latest developments in poultry research and farming technologies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is generally understandable, but it could benefit from refinement to meet the standards expected in scholarly communications. While the technical terminology is appropriate, there are areas where sentence structure is complex or awkward, potentially affecting clarity and readability. For example: Long, Complex Sentences, Grammar and Punctuation, and Technical Jargon</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript has strong scientific merit but requires refinement in language, structure, and the inclusion of more recent references to meet the standards of high-quality scholarly communication.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Gabriel Gbenga Babaniyi
Department, University & Country	Agricultural and Rural Management Training Institute, Nigeria