

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129253
Title of the Manuscript:	Feed Additives for Layer Chicken Health and Production: A Review
Type of the Article	Review

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of feed additives for layer chickens, addressing their impact on health and productivity. It holds significant importance for the scientific community as it explores sustainable alternatives to antibiotics, aligning with global regulatory and consumer demands. The review bridges gaps between research and practical application, offering insights into optimizing feed strategies for improved poultry performance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Feed Additives for Layer Chicken Health and Production: A Review", is suitable as it clearly reflects the manuscript's focus. However, for a more engaging and precise title, consider: "Advancing Layer Chicken Productivity: A Comprehensive Review of Feed Additives."	
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.	The abstract is well-written and provides a concise overview of the manuscript. However, it could benefit from the following additions: -Mention of the limitations or challenges associated with feed additives. -A brief statement about the need for further research or practical implementation strategies.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate, with a solid foundation of recent research findings. However, it lacks critical analysis of challenges, such as cost-effectiveness and variability in outcomes, which should be included to enhance its scholarly value.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and cover a broad spectrum of topics. However, some references are outdated. Recent studies from developing regions, where the adoption of feed additives is critical, should be included to provide a more global perspective. Suggested references: Recent articles on regional challenges in Africa and Asia. Papers focusing on the economic feasibility of feed additives.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical corrections and simplification of overly technical terms in some sections (e.g., the prebiotics and organic acids sections) would improve readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript could benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Comparative analysis of the effectiveness of different feed additives. -Practical implementation details, such as dosage and cost considerations. -Better integration of tables into the narrative for enhanced readability and impact. <p>.....</p> <p>Major Issues and Suggested Corrections</p> <p>1. Lack of Critical Analysis Original Sentence: The review highlights the importance of selecting the right additive combinations for optimal effects. Problem: - This statement focuses only on the benefits without discussing potential risks or limitations. Corrected Sentence: The review highlights the importance of selecting the right additive combinations for optimal effects while considering challenges such as economic feasibility, variability in results across breeds, and potential regulatory hurdles.</p> <p>2. Overuse of Technical Language in Prebiotics Section Original Sentence: Inulin is categorized as a fructan, meaning that fructose units with a terminal glucose molecule make up its structure. Problem: - Overly technical and may confuse readers without a biochemistry background. Corrected Sentence: Inulin is a type of prebiotic that supports beneficial gut bacteria by serving as a substrate for fermentation in the colon.</p> <p>3. Insufficient Discussion on Practical Implementation Original Sentence: Probiotics, such as Lactobacillus strains, improve gut health and nutrient absorption. Problem: - No details on how to apply probiotics effectively (e.g., dosage, timing). Corrected Sentence: Probiotics, such as Lactobacillus strains, improve gut health and nutrient absorption when administered at an optimal dosage of 10⁸ CFU/g in feed, typically included daily to ensure consistent benefits.</p> <p>4. Missing Comparative Evaluation Original Sentence: Prebiotics and probiotics both enhance gut health and immunity in layer chickens. Problem: - Does not provide a comparative analysis of prebiotics versus probiotics. Corrected Sentence: While prebiotics enhance gut health by selectively stimulating beneficial bacteria, probiotics directly introduce live beneficial microbes. Studies suggest probiotics may show faster effects on gut health, while prebiotics offer longer-term stability.</p> <p>5. Weak Integration of Tables Original Sentence: Mineral supplements like calcium and phosphorus are essential for eggshell quality. Problem: - Does not reference the detailed table on minerals provided in the manuscript. Corrected Sentence: Mineral supplements like calcium and phosphorus, as outlined in Table 1, are essential for eggshell quality and skeletal strength, with calcium deficiencies leading to weaker shells and bones.</p> <p>6. Outdated and Limited Regional Focus in References Original Sentence: Studies show that organic acids enhance nutrient digestibility and absorption, improving production performance. Problem: - References are outdated and lack a global perspective. Corrected Sentence: Recent studies, particularly from Asia and Africa, indicate that organic acids like citric acid enhance nutrient</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>digestibility and absorption, improving production performance under diverse environmental conditions (Kim et al., 2023; Ahmed et al., 2024).</p> <p>7. Insufficient Focus on Sustainability Challenges</p> <p>Original Sentence: Feed additives offer sustainable and antibiotic-free options for poultry production.</p> <p>Problem: - Does not discuss the environmental impact of producing feed additives.</p> <p>Corrected Sentence: Feed additives offer sustainable and antibiotic-free options for poultry production, though their large-scale production and resource demands pose potential environmental challenges requiring further research.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Ahmed Elsaid Ali Mostafa
Department, University & Country	Delta University for Science and Technology, Egypt