

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JALSI_123039</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Apparent digestibility (Da) of feed rations containing different levels of incorporation of germinated off-season sorghum in broilers from start-up to finishing in the town of Maroua in the Far North of Cameroon.</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Good as finding an alternative feed ingredient in feeding poultry	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	According to the objectives of the study the author findings were sound to the field of poultry nutrition of poulters so that he found a good substitution to imported ingredients like maize. It will more pronouns if they made an economical appraisal to compare the revenue for the three treatments so that they can find the most economical one	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	More references during the years 2023 and 2024 are appreciated. There are missing references marked with red ink found either in the text and not in the references chapter or vice versa	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No more comments, there were minor changes done in the review followed with the vertical lines at the left side. Also some exclamations well shown in the text and tables	

**PART 2:**

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

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sayda Awad Mohamed Ali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gezira University, Sudan</b>