

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122199
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic Characterization of Indigenous Turkeys (Meleagris gallopavo) in the Ashanti, Ahafo, Bono and Bono East Regions of Ghana
Type of the 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.	The MS is good and well written yet containing some errors. Some useful suggestions have been provided as trak changes.	I have worked on it
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ok	
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.	Some corrections needed.	I have corrected all the mistakes
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Ok	
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 MS is well written and informative and has provided some new aspects about Turkey's genetic characterization. It can serve as base of AnGR characterization for Ghanna.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Ok	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	May be read by some English Editor.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	