

Peer Review

Review of: "Phenotypic Characteristics and Factors Associated with Assaf Lamb Body Weight and Morphology"

Thamer Aljubouri¹

1. Department of Animal Production, College of Agriculture, Al-Qasim Green University, Iraq

Reviewers Comments

Major comments

Title: Phenotypic Characteristics and Factors Associated with Assaf Lamb Body Weight and Morphology

Thank you so much for selecting me as a reviewer for this important manuscript describing the important sheep breeds in the Middle East, and the identification of phenotypic characteristics and factors associated with Assaf lamb body weight and morphology. Such research is very important and impressive, and effective for future breeding efforts. I have reviewed the whole manuscript and found it interesting and well-designed. However, I am providing some comments below.

Title: Okay

Abstract: It needs to be rephrased with reference to the most important results (weights and body measurements) and the moral effect. And, before using any abbreviated word, please elaborate on it first.

Keywords: Please put words 4 to 6 other than the words in the title.

Introduction:

Well-described problem statements, research hypotheses, and the aim of the research.

Materials and Methods:

To avoid any possible confusion --- using the same standard (Tabbaa 1999)—please indicate the standard that you followed. Why have you put a reference to AlTarayrah and Tabbaa, (1999) - do you follow their procedure?

Statistical analysis

The author(s) had mentioned the use of a linear mixed model. I don't see any random effect other than the residual. Has the author forgotten to mention random effects like the animal in the present case? If the answer is NO, then this is not a mixed model.

Also, I couldn't see parity being used in the preliminary model. Was it used along with the age of the dams? Then it would be confounding. Please provide the details of how many models the author tried to come up with the present model. What

criteria were chosen to select this model? What was the final model then?

Results and Discussion

I have gone through the tables and overall results. I have a few suggestions to make. It seemed like your choice of the model may have had some effect on your results

I would like to suggest you use significant factors in the model along with animals as a random effect. You may use the interaction effect first (separately along with other effects). If the interaction effect is found non-significant, re-run and provide a suitable interpretation of your result.

I suggest rewording and merging birth, weaning, and marketing weights into one paragraph, and body measurements into one paragraph, then discussing the results. Please rephrase and explain the most important results according to Table 1.

The conclusion of the abstract is still general. It suggests providing more specific data to support the obtained findings.

In the discussion section, no adequate comparison has been made to compare the recent work with similar works in the same field of expertise. It is needed to highlight the novel achievements made by this work that are not made in these similar articles. In the same section, many conclusive remarks are repeatedly written without discussing many other issues that surround the present.

The conclusions of both the abstract and discussion repeat the methodology used in the study, and I think more efforts are required to give clearer insights into the main benefits of the present work.

More comments in the discussion. It is not sufficient to mention the related papers that conducted studies without discussing the possible missing ring that has been fulfilled in this article. Please put serious concern for this point in this section and rewrite accordingly.

General suggestion

Please check all the references and their citations in the text as per the guidelines.

Please follow the same style for referencing and some editing mistakes – please correct them.

References 1, 2, 9, 27, 37, 40. Please check and correct.

Attachments: available at <https://doi.org/10.32388/KHAOWR>

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.