



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_47125
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Neem Leaf (Azadirachta indica) Meal as an Alternative to Antibiotic in Broiler Ration
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Page 2: Introduction – (Last five lines of the introduction)</p> <p>“Considering the vast alternative to antibiotics” should be revised. I suggest that you put them under 1.1 Aims and Objectives.</p> <p>Materials and Methods 2.1 Experimental Site: Lines 1-5: Consider revising these statements. I suggest you minimize the use of the article “The”</p> <p>Page 3: 2.2 Materials - Line 2Consider using chicks were TRANSPORTED to the..... The statements sounds more like methods.</p> <p>2.3 Experimental treatments T1: Delete S at the end of the line.</p> <p>2.6 Study Parameters I suggest you use “The following parameters were used to determine the production” Consider revising the statement.</p> <p>Page 4: 3.1. Production Performances of broiler chickens – I suggest you delete lines 1-3 and list the parameters under the table.</p> <p>Page 5: 3.1.2. – 3.1.4: Make a simple link between your observation and assertions used. 3.2: Consider using “ Biochemical ANALYSIS of broiler chickens” Avoid the use of “such as” instead, just state the parameters determined only.</p> <p>Page 6: Table 2: Delete the word SOME</p> <p>Page 7: 3.3 Consider the using “Differential Count” Delete statements i.e. lines 1 – 3 Table 3: Delete the word LEUKOCYTES</p> <p>Page 10: Delete the word WERE in line 1’ 4. Conclusion: Consider revising this. Also reduce the use of the article “The”. Delete the word SO in line 11. From the word so, “Neem tree” To the end sound more like a conclusion while the statements before that are more like part of the discussion. Ethical Approval: Delete the phrase “has been collected” and instead use WAS OBTAINED Also state where this was obtained from</p>	<p>Thanks for your very sincere work for the improvement of my article. It was a great advantage to me for getting this kind hearted support. All the recommended correction has been done by me as correctly as possible. It is very well understanding reviewer comments thanks again.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Topic is relevant to the field. Has good methodology with reliable supporting evidence.	Thanks for your 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>	