



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_45429
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Dietary Tapioca Levels on Growth Performance and Meat Characteristics of Pigs
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> References are not consistent: Line 24 and throughout the article. <input type="checkbox"/> Line 44: what are you replacing with tapioca in your study? <input type="checkbox"/> What is the objective of the study? <input type="checkbox"/> Table1- what type of molasses did you use? Liquid molasses? <input type="checkbox"/> Line 65 – vit-min is not included in the table. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent throughout the article: Pigs or swine? <input type="checkbox"/> Line 127 to 133 repetition from Line 20 to 30 <input type="checkbox"/> Line 40- did you do cost benefit of feeding tapioca? <input type="checkbox"/> Table 2- data presented is from which stage? Line 54 and what do you mean by average FCR? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reference added in the reference section. ▪ Corn was replaced by tapioca. ▪ Objective is added in the end of introduction section. ▪ Liquid molasses was added. ▪ In the footnote it is mentioned in the table. ▪ Swine is used. ▪ According to suggestion, corrected. ▪ Cost benefit of feeding tapioca was not done. ▪ At 14th weeks of age which is mentioned in the table heading. ▪ Average FCR will be only FCR which is already corrected.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	It is a good paper the only issue I had with it is the English and I hope after effecting all the corrections that I have suggested, it can be published.	

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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>Submit Animal Ethics committee Reference Number.</p>	<p>Animal Ethics committee Reference Number is not available with me, but ethical committee's suggestions for management is included. If you suggest, then I may omit. The institute mainly followed EU Ethics.</p> <p>Korea also followed Welfare Quality Assessment Protocol for Pigs (Sows and Piglets, Growing and Finishing Pigs) from https://www.google.co.kr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CBsQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.welfarequalitynetwork.net%2Fdownloadattachment%2F45627%2F21651%2FPig%2520Protocol.pdf&ei=XyXzU6LMEcG48gXyjYC4Dg&usq=AFQjCNG5G_tOnriEP5ZLdOhmEFnXoQ8g5Q</p>