

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
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

#### **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)
<b>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.</b>	Addressing feed supplementation in the Konkan region is beneficial since such localized studies can optimize poultry practices for specific climates and conditions. However, this study has discussed limited parameters, information like statistical analysis, feed formulation, mechanism of action shatavari root powder, and its preparation and inclusion method in feed is lacking.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Title is suitable.	
<b>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.</b>	Abstract is precise.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes	
<b>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.</b>	Technically this manuscript is not robust. Information in Introduction section does not have any scientific reference, that is considered invalid. Methodology section is lacking information about the feed formulation and preparation, addition of shatavari root powder at the expense of which feed ingredient? statistical analysis. Very few references are added in result section which is not sufficient.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References are not sufficient. Introduction section does not contain any reference.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	There are some grammatical mistakes (use of past and future tense at some places is not appropriate)	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Aulia Kanwal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Comsats University Islamabad, Pakistan</b>