



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Climate Change and Poultry Farming: A Systematic Review of Environmental, Health, and Production Impacts
Type of Article:	Review Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read this systematic review with great interest because climate change and poultry production is a very hot and important topic right now, especially for developing countries. The authors tried to use the PRISMA guidelines to give an update from 2020 to 2026, which is good. However, I have very serious concerns about how this manuscript was prepared. My biggest concern and this is a major problem, is that the text citations and the reference list do not match at all. Many authors cited in the main text are completely missing from the references, and many papers in the reference list are never mentioned in the text. This makes me worry if the authors actually read these papers or if the text was badly generated by an external tool without careful checking. Secondly, the methodology has a big contradiction. The authors say it is a systematic review, but they included other review papers inside their final 30 selected studies. A systematic review should look at primary empirical data, otherwise you are just doing a review of reviews (an umbrella review), which changes the whole nature of the paper. Lastly, the presentation of results is very superficial. Table 1 looks too simple, almost like a high school summary, lacking any real data, numbers, or specific parameters that a journal expects. I provide my specific comments below to help the authors completely overhaul their manuscript.



<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
1. Abstract You mentioned that 30 studies met the inclusion criteria. You must state clearly in the abstract how many of these were original experimental papers and how many were review papers, because right now it is confusing. The conclusion in the abstract is too generic. Can you add a specific percentage or key quantitative finding? For example, what climate stressor was found to cause the highest percentage of mortality based on your reviewed papers?
2. Introduction Look at the first two paragraphs. You cited Prabakaran & Valavan (2021), Li et al. (2022), Zhang et al. (2023), He et al. (2023), Fodor et al. (2024), Garcia et al. (2021), Ali et al. (2022), and Khan et al. (2023). None of these papers are in your reference list. On the other side, your reference list has names like Akbar et al. (2021), Brown et al. (2021), and Arora & Kumar (2024), but they are never mentioned in the Introduction or anywhere in the text. This is a massive mistake. The authors must check every single citation one by one. In paragraph 4, you talk about greenhouse gases like methane and nitrous oxide from poultry. Poultry mostly produces carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide from manure management; ruminants are the main source of methane. Please fix this technical accuracy.
3. Methodology You listed ResearchGate as an electronic database. ResearchGate is a social network for scientists, not a curated index database like Scopus or PubMed. Searching ResearchGate systematically is not reproducible because search results change based on user algorithms. You should remove this or explain how a systematic search is even possible there. You wrote: "Both original empirical studies and review articles were considered eligible". If you include other reviews in your synthesis, you are double-counting data because those reviews already synthesized older papers. I highly advise excluding secondary review papers and focusing only on empirical studies to make your systematic review robust.
Figure 1: The caption says: "Figure 1. Write your figure caption here." This shows very careless editing. Authors forgot to write the actual caption before submitting. Please replace this placeholder text.
4. Results The text under Results is just repeating general concepts about heat stress that we already know from textbooks. Since this is a systematic review of 30 papers, tell us exactly what those 30 papers found! For example, how many of the 30 papers were from Africa? How many from Asia? What was the temperature range studied? Table 1 is unacceptable: The table is way too basic for a reputable journal. "Key Impacts: reduced growth, mortality" - this is too simple. You need to expand this table significantly. Add columns for: Reference/Author, Geographic Location / Country, Poultry Type (Broiler, Layer, or Indigenous), Specific Findings (e.g., "Feed conversion ratio increased by 10% at 35°C"). Right now, Table 1 gives no real value to the reader.
5. Discussion The section heading "Best-Practiced Method" sounds very strange in English. Usually, we call this "Effective Adaptation Mechanisms" or "Synthesis of Climate-Smart Practices." In the "Strengths and Limitations" section, you cited Li et al. (2022) again, which is still missing in the references. The discussion is too descriptive. You need to explain why heat stress causes lower egg shell quality (e.g., respiratory alkalosis, drop in blood calcium). Connecting the systematic findings to the underlying physiology will make the discussion much deeper.
6. Declarations and References



The AI declaration says ChatGPT was used for grammar. That is fine, but the fact that so many citations are "ghosts" (in text but not in references) makes me think the tool might have hallucinated some sentences or citations. The authors must take full responsibility and clean this up. Clean up the formatting of the references. Some have DOIs, some have URLs, some have weird formatting (like Liao, X. et al. (2026). Nature Communications. (2026). - repeating the year twice). Make sure it matches the specific style sheet of the journal.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript discusses an important and timely topic, especially because poultry farming is highly vulnerable to heat stress, disease risks, and resource limitations caused by climate change. The paper has practical value, but it still needs stronger methodological clarity and deeper synthesis before it can be considered a rigorous systematic review.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The methodology needs more detail to support the claim that this is a systematic review. The authors should provide the exact search dates, complete search strings for each database, and the process used for screening studies. Without these details, the review is difficult to reproduce.
The manuscript does not clearly report any quality appraisal or risk-of-bias assessment of the included studies. This is important because the strength of the conclusions depends not only on the number of studies included, but also on the quality of their evidence.
The results are mostly general and descriptive. The authors should add a clearer summary of the 30 included studies, such as study design, country, poultry type, climate stressor, and main findings. This would help readers see where the evidence is strong or weak.
The discussion repeats many points already presented in the results section. It should provide more critical interpretation, such as which adaptation strategies are most practical, which are costly, and which are supported by stronger evidence.
Some references and citations need careful checking. There are cited authors in the text that appear unclear or not fully matched with the reference list, and some reference details look incomplete. This affects the credibility of the review.
The conclusion is relevant but too broad. It would be stronger if it directly reflected the main limitations of the evidence and gave more specific recommendations for future research, especially for developing countries and smallholder poultry farmers.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			