

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125665
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of feeding Ginger (Zingiber officinale) powder on body weight of Konkan Kanyal kids
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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 article is important for the scientific community as it explores natural feed additives in livestock management. This would be a key interest in sustainable agriculture. It could also provide valuable insights into enhancing animal growth and health. It could also provide a context where antibiotic use in animal feed is declining. I appreciate the testing ginger and its potential implications for improving feed efficiency. However, further details on the long-term effects of ginger supplementation would enhance the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Here's a suggested alternative title: "Impact of Ginger (Zingiber officinale) Powder Supplementation on the Growth Performance of Konkan Kanyal Kids over a 90-Day Feeding Trial"</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 provides a clear overview of the study. But it could benefit from a few improvements to enhance its clarity. Here are my suggestions: Methodology: It would be helpful to explain the randomized block design in more detail. A mention of how body weight was measured (weekly or monthly) would add clarity. Statistical Analysis: It would be helpful to specify which statistical methods were used. Key Findings: The abstract could provide more specific data points. For instance the addition of final average body weights and the highest weight gain in treatment T5 would be informative. Concluding Remark: The conclusion in the abstract could be slightly expanded. Its purpose to express the broader implications of the findings for goat farmers.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but a few modifications could improve flow of the paper. Here are my suggestions for organizing the manuscript more effectively: Introduction The introduction is well-structured that provides a background on feed additives. It provides details about the economic importance of goat farming and the rationale for using ginger. However, it could be slightly shortened to focus more on the gap in current research. It should also focus more on study objectives. Materials and Methods (instead of just "Methodology") This section should include clear subheadings, such as: 1. Experimental Design 2. Animals and Diets 3. Data Collection 4. Statistical Analysis Results and Discussion This section combines both results and their interpretation that which is fine. But it might be more organized if split into two sections: Results: Present the raw findings without too much discussion. Discussion: Interpret the results, compare them with previous studies and explains the importance. This would provide a better logical flow from the data to the broader implications. Conclusion This is appropriately placed. But it could be more impactful if the potential applications of the findings are included for goat farmers. Optional Additional Section: Implications for Practical Recommendations: Adding a short section to highlight how the findings can</p>	

Review Form 3

	be implemented in real-world goat farming could make the manuscript more practical.	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. Because it provides a clear experimental design, the use of a well-defined Randomized Block Design (RBD) and appropriate statistical analysis. The study systematically explores the effect of different levels of ginger supplementation on body weight gain. Furthermore, the significant differences in body weight gain observed between the treatment groups are backed by statistical validation ($P < 0.05$) that strengthens the credibility of the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references included in the manuscript are relevant but somewhat limited in number. Many references are older or region-specific. Addition of more recent and broader studies could enhance the manuscript's depth and relevance to a wider scientific audience. Specifically, more recent studies on ginger as a feed additive and its role in livestock growth would be beneficial.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the manuscript is generally understandable. The technical content is clear; there are several areas where the writing could be improved for clarity, conciseness and grammatical accuracy. For example, some sentences are awkwardly structured. There are also minor grammatical errors that might affect readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the manuscript presents valuable insights into the effects of ginger supplementation on the body weight gain of kids. There are a few areas that could be strengthened. Clarification of Results: The results section could benefit from more in-depth analysis and discussion of why certain levels of ginger powder had the observed effects. A deeper exploration of the biological mechanisms behind these findings would make the paper more comprehensive. Practical Implications: It would be useful to include a section on the practical applications of this research. For example, how could small-scale farmers incorporate these findings into their feeding practices? What are the potential economic benefits? Formatting and Presentation: The Improvements in the formatting of tables and ensuring uniformity in the presentation of data would enhance the readability of the manuscript.	

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:	Hafiz Aftab Ahmed
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Pakistan