



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3193
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF TWO DIFFERENT FEED FORMULATIONS TO ENSURE THE GROWTH OF YOUNG PIGEON SQUABS
Type of the Article	

**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> REVISION comments</b>  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<p>Yes, the manuscript's importance involves evaluating its originality, methodological rigor, and potential to advance understanding or solve a significant problem within the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes it is good. However, if it is written as such, "comparison between instead of" would be the best.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>The articles needs discussion, it has only given results. There is no any discussion about graphs given in below results and discussion.</p> <p>It will be correct if the above correction is made.</p> <p>For a good article, there must be at least 30 references.</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Noted</p>



<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<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>	