

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_123634
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Using Organic Acids to Substitute Antibiotic Growth Promoter on the Growth Performance of Broiler Chickens
Type of the Article	Original 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**

<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>	This manuscript is highly relevant as it addresses a critical issue in poultry farming, finding effective alternatives to antibiotic growth promoters (AGPs). With growing concerns about antimicrobial resistance, the study's exploration of organic acids as a substitute for AGPs offers valuable insights for researchers and industry professionals seeking sustainable farming practices. I appreciate the study's focus on practical solutions, though I believe further explanation of long-term impacts on poultry health would strengthen its contribution.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is clear but could be more precise. A possible alternative could be: "Evaluating Organic Acids as Alternatives to Antibiotic Growth Promoters in Enhancing Broiler Chicken Performance."	
<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>	The abstract is mostly comprehensive but lacks clarity in a few areas. It would benefit from specifying the statistical significance of the results for better context and mentioning the exact percentages or improvements in growth performance. Also, adding a line about the potential limitations or future directions would give a more rounded overview.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections that guide the reader through the research process. The "Material and Methods" section is particularly detailed, which is crucial for reproducibility. However, the "Results and Discussion" could be more concise in places to improve flow and readability.	
<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>	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, as it employs a randomized design and standard methods for assessing broiler performance. The statistical analysis, using ANOVA, is appropriate, and the results align with previous studies on organic acids. The study is technically sound, though additional exploration into the long-term effects of organic acid supplementation on broiler health would enhance its scientific depth.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient, recent, and relevant to the topic. However, some more recent studies (post-2020) could be included to reflect the latest advancements in antibiotic alternatives for poultry farming.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few minor grammatical issues and awkward phrasing that could be improved for clarity. For instance, some sentences in the abstract and introduction are long and convoluted, reducing readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of sustainable poultry farming. With a few revisions for clarity, conciseness, and exploration of longer-term impacts, it can significantly influence the adoption of organic acids as AGP alternatives. The methodology is solid, and the findings are aligned with current trends in poultry nutrition research.  <b>The study is valuable, well-structured, and addresses an important issue in the field of poultry nutrition by offering alternatives to antibiotics. The methodology and results are scientifically sound, but there are minor improvements needed in language clarity, ethical declarations, and further exploration of long-term impacts. Overall, it is a strong and impactful contribution.</b>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Gabriel Gbenga Babaniyi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Agricultural and Rural Management Training Institute, Nigeria</b>