

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_120603
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Guinea fowl (Numida meleagris) production system in the urban commune of Madarounda, Niger.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research is nice and provides insights into the importance of Guinea fowl production system in Niger. The data generated from the questionnaire survey is very crucial to understanding the ongoing measures of production and improving future production systems. However, the manuscript needs to be edited with corrections.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, it is comprehensive but needs some details in the sentences. Like, the questionnaire survey conducted.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, the Discussion part is missing.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The data is collected through a questionnaire with sampling methods applied. This enables us to understand the local people's perception as well as current measures applied for the Guinea fowl production system in 6 different areas. However, more work needs to be done in the discussion section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No there was another language used in the result section's last paragraph.	
Optional/General comments	Comments are provided in the manuscript.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nikeet Pradhan
Department, University & Country	Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal