



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_46134
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate composition dried liquid fluid with spray drying method with various hydrocolloids
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The title is vague, it should therefore be reframed to avoid repetition. There is a need for reconciliation between the number of samples in the abstract and item 2.2. The abstract and items 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 are copied from published papers (proximate composition of rumen digesta from sheep and slaughtered in zuru, Kebbi State).</p> <p>The paper has some confusing statement by mentioning proximate and organic and inorganic nutrients, there is need for consistency.</p> <p>The discussion of the paper is not proper as it compares solid with liquid waste.</p> <p>The conclusion of the paper is not in relation to the topic, this should consider fluid and spray drying.</p> <p>The recommendation of the paper is very poor</p>	<b>Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers.</b>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Revisit the punctuations	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper requires to be revisited generally because there are a lot of copied work from published papers.	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	
<b>If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximate composition of rumen digesta from sheep slaughtered in Zuru, Kebbi State, Nigeria <a href="http://www.integrityresjournals.org/jasp/index.html">www.integrityresjournals.org/jasp/index.html</a></li> <li>Proximate Composition of Sun-Dried Rumen Digesta from Goat Slaughtered in Zuru Central Slaughterhouse, Kebbi State, Nigeria</li> </ol>	