

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126515
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EFFECT OF FEEDING MAIWA AND PEARL MILLET AS DIETARY ENERGY SOURCE FOR BROILER CHICKEN
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	importance of unconventional feed additive..... 1. rewrite because background should be added 2. compare with start and end weight 3. conclusion should be simple sentence	
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 the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	attached	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes but major revision needed	
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.	more appropriate references needed	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Arafat Jaman
Department, University & Country	Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University (HSTU), Bangladesh