



|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Name:                    | <a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_UPJOZ_3165  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>The effects of KEPROGAN® as an additive in chicken feed on biochemical tests and the immune systems of the chickens</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original research article</b>   |

**General guideline:**

**This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘lack of Novelty’**, provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



## 1: Review Comments

|   | Reviewer's comment   | Author's feedback |
|---|--|-------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments<br><br><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br><br><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br><br><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br><br><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><br><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b> | Yes<br><br>Yes<br><br>Yes<br><br>Yes, but conclusion could have been mentioned properly in a separate section.<br><br>Yes<br><br>Yes, they are sufficient. | Okay              |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments   |  |                   |



|                          |   |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
|                          | Write the conclusion under separate section.<br>Correct the marked words in the manuscript. |  |
| <b>Optional</b> comments |   |  |

**PART 2:**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

