



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_49056
Title of the Manuscript:	Production and valorization of maggot meal: sustainable source of proteins for indigenous chicks
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"> In the abstract part; long introductory sentences in the aims!!! In the keywords, please, add fly word. The references should be written [5, 6] or [7,8,9] etc..... Eight weeks is very long period of rearing of broiler chickens, it is about six weeks. What about the protein content of maggot meal??!! Recent references should be included in the discussion section. The references should be written in the same style. Many references are written in language rather than English!!! What about the opinion of Ethical Committee for animal using in the experiment?! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They were not broiler chickens, but rather the indigenous chickens. Sorry, unfortunately the proximate analysis of the diets was not taken in consideration in this study. At the time of completion of this study, there was not yet Ethical Committee for animal in Cameroon. The rest of the reviewer's comments were very constructive and were taken into consideration in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	