

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125710
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of feed supplementation of Shatavari root powder (<i>Asparagus racemosus</i>) on growth performance of broiler in Konkan region
Type of the Article	Research 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

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)
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.	This manuscript represents a new milestone in broiler rearing, focusing on the use of natural feed resources. It lays a foundation for future research on blood biochemistry. Although the performance of broilers fed Shatavari root powder is not detailed in this manuscript, it provides a preliminary insight into the use of natural feed resources. SEE ATTACHMENT	
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.	The abstract does not accurately reflect all the results. It needs to include key findings such as feed consumption and, if possible, the feed conversion ratio (FCR).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need more subsection in Materials and Methods and structure are appropriate.	
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.	The data analysis and presentation are not up to the mark and need correction. By promoting the use of natural feed resources in broiler rearing and discouraging farmers from using antibiotics, this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound based on the performance results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are not sufficient, and some are not recent. No reference were found on introduction section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Md. Imran Hossain
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Bangladesh