



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
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
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<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><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>		



Optional 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdul Hakeem
Department, University & Country	University of Balochistan, Pakistan