

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_123661
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Cowpea ( <i>Vigna unguiculata</i> ) Hay, Wheat Bran and Their Mixtures Supplementation on Dry Matter and Nutrient Digestibility of Begait Lambs Fed Grass Hay as a Basal Diet
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	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><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></p>	<p>The idea of the study is important for the scientific community. Because it aims to partially substitute the wheat bran, which is purchased from the market with Cowpea hay which farmers can produce at their farm. The manuscript also aimed to enhance the dry matter and nutrient digestibility by creating a favorable remen microenvironment through mixing cowpea hay with wheat bran. However, there are serious issues to be considered regarding the methodology and the quality of the language.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>It is good if the type of grass used for this study is mentioned in the title. I think it is natural grass hay. Other wise the title of the article is suitable. Therefore, the title could be "Effect of Cowpea (Vigna unguiculata) Hay, Wheat Bran and Their Mixtures Supplementation on Dry Matter and Nutrient Digestibility of Begait Lambs Fed <b>Natural</b> Grass Hay as a Basal Diet</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>The author has tried to indicate the Objective, design, methodology, results and conclusion of the study. However there are some issues to be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract is expected to stand alone by itself. This means it should convey full information alone. Therefore, the abbreviations in the abstract should be written in full.</li> <li>• The objective of the study should not be just to evaluate effect of different proportion of wheat bran and cowpea hay supplementation. The core objective should be to identify the most appropriate proportion. Therefore, the second objective "To <b>identify the most appropriate proportion of wheat bran and cowpea hay supplementation on dry matter and nutrient digestibility of Begait lambs fed natural grass hay as a basal diet</b>" Should be added.</li> <li>• The conclusion should be revised. Since the author didn't have un-supplemented treatment, he can't talk about improvement in dry matter and nutrient digestibility. rather it is better to conclude which treatment induced the highest dry matter and nutrient digestibility and tell which treatment you recommend.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>The methodology of this manuscript is <b>not</b> scientifically correct. Because the author used the dry matter and nutrient intake data of another work. You can check this under table 4. The author has indicated the source for his dry matter and nutrient intake data is reference number [7]. I have tried to check the full manuscript of reference number [7]. It is the author's own work in which he evaluated the growth performance and carcass traits of the same lambs. We can't use the dry matter and nutrient intake of the growth trial for the digestibility trial. Because the dry matter and nutrient intake during the digestibility trial will vary from the growth trial due to the fitted fecal collection bag. Therefore, the author should use the dry matter and nutrient intake of the digestibility trial period if he has that data and re-calculate all the values of dry matter and nutrient intake as well as apparent digestibility coefficients and re-write the whole paper accordingly.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references are sufficient. However, the author is advised to use the recent ones.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	More or less, the English quality of the article is suitable. However, the author is advised to accept the comments given by track changes on the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I have indicated valuable comments on the manuscript by track changes. I suggest the author access those 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>Berhanu Tassew Dassie</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Adami Tulu Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia</b>