

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_122797
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of finishing strategies on the performance and profitability of Boran crossbred cattle
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

Compulsory 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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Review Feedback</p> <p>“Effects of Finishing Strategies on the Performance and Profitability of Boran Crossbred Cattle”.</p> <p>Findings: The Effects of finishing strategies on the performance and profitability of Boran crossbred cattle was scientifically and adequately investigated. The experimental design and data collection method were scientifically suitable for the research objectives. The data collected, were scientifically analyzed and the results were systematically presented for easy understanding. Finally the objectives of the research were satisfactorily achieved.</p> <p>Contribution of the Research to the Knowledge: The findings in the research presented a very good recommendation to cattle formers. The researcher was able to come into conclusion that the more profitable finishing feeding practice in cattle was “grazing with concentrate supplementation”. The researcher has proven his capabilities in the field of Animal Production and Economic.</p> <p>Adequacy, Shortcomings and Suggestions</p> <p>“The Tittle”: The tittle “The Effects of finishing strategies on the performance and profitability of Boran crossbred cattle” was suitable for the work.</p> <p>Suggestion: Hence the recommendation was specifically based on feeding practice (P1, P2 & P3), it would have been better to change the tittle of the work to “The Effects of finishing feeding practices on the performance and profitability of Boran crossbred cattle”. However the original tittle can still be maintained if extra conclusion and recommendations are made base on the time of slaughtering (S1, S2 & S3)</p> <p>“Abstract”: The abstract was comprehensively written.</p> <p>“Introduction”: The introduction was satisfactorily written. It covers all the necessary aspect</p> <p>“Material and Method ”: The materials and method of data collection and analyses employed in the research were adequate and scientifically acceptable.</p> <p>“Result and Discussion”: The results were satisfactorily and systematically presented for easy understanding.</p> <p>Suggestion: Table 3, 4 and 5 will be more robust if the mean performances and profitability of P1, P2 and P3 at each Slaughtering periods (S1, S2 & S3) were presented. This will enable the farmers or stake holders to know the slaughtering period that is more profitable for P1, P2, and P3.</p> <p>“Conclusion and Recommendation”: The conclusion and recommendation were in concurrent with the findings in the research however they should be less specific to make the research more robust.</p> <p>GOODLUCK.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Onwuneme
Department, University & Country	Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Nigeria