

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOAIR_4559
Title of the Manuscript:	Broiler Farming in Hathazari, Bangladesh: A Study of Management and Outcomes.
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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it provides knowledge on the management practices adapted by broiler chicken farmers in Hathazari region, Chittagong. The study provides valuable insights into overall production performance of boiler farms based on direct interview of farmers, visual inspection of farms and farm records. The methodology is reliable and valid.	Thank you for the positive feedback.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive in terms of covering the key aspects of the research. It provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. However, for clarity, start the abstract with the study aim.	We have made a correction in the abstract part.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The systematic and clear methodology for the assessment of the management system and production of broiler poultry makes this manuscript scientifically robust and technically sound. The findings are adequately presented and discussed, and recommendations are meaningful contributions to the field of broiler production.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent. However, the in-text reference should be superscripted (x^2) and consistent in format -number or text, not both. See 3.2.5 and Discussion. Also, the in-text number reference should not be used to make statements in the body. See Discussion.	We have revised the article and corrected all the mistakes.

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is clear but a few grammatically corrections should be made as highlighted in the manuscripts. For example, punctuation marks should be placed in right places and the first sentence under 2.6 should be expunged for its irrelevance.	We have corrected all mistakes as per reviewer suggestions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Generally, this is a novel research on broiler management and outcomes based on the study area. It is scientifically correct and well analysed. It contributes to the body of knowledge on broiler poultry production in Hathazari region and provides a good insight for prospective investors. The conclusion is correct based on the scientific analysis.</p> <p>Apparently, there are no apparent ethical issues in this manuscript. This type of study should usually not raise ethical concerns. However, it would be beneficial to confirm that informed consent was obtained from participants and that their anonymity was protected.</p> <p>There are no competing interest issues evident in this manuscript.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	<p>This study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. To ensure privacy, participants' anonymity was protected by using coded identifiers and securing all personal information.</p> <p>The authors declare that they have no competing interests.</p>

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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	