

### 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)
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.	In the present era, research on safe substitutes to antibiotic growth promoters is necessary, so this study has good importance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Modified as shown	
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.	It is OK	
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.	The manuscript is technically sound, however few corrections as suggested may be incorporated.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Few more references have been added as shown	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language seems to be suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

#### **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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Sheikh Adil Hamid
Department, University & Country	SKUAST-K, India