



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12592
Title of the Manuscript:	Livestock Production and Milk Supply Chain in Peri-urban Areas of Jhang Pakistan
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The abstract should be precise and represent the research paper with aims, methods, major findings and conclusion. No citation is required in this section. Introduction: the problem statement, what has been done and the research gap is not indicated. In addition, the manuscript lacks objective/s. Result and discussion: major findings of the research should be stated, supported by tables and figures, followed by discussion with comparison/similarities with other works. It should be exhaustive. See the comments on the word file.	The abstract is précised; Citation has been removed from abstract. Problem statement and research gap is highlighted in the abstract. Modification have been done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Caption for figure 1 should be included Provide where citations are missing Avoid local terms/as we are working with international scientific community See the comments on the word file.	Local terms are also changed. All other changes take place in original revised paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The title 'production' is broad. I think what is considered in the manuscript is not sufficient in relation to the topic/production, and if possible we might include other aspects of production such as breeds kept, feeding and feed sources, watering, breeding system, marketing and record keeping. If possible comparison can be made with urban diary system or can be viewed as smallholder Vs commercial, or based on farm size. I have general comment to check what is possible.	Topic is now modified in the erevised paper.