



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_27669
Title of the Manuscript:	Trend in animal farming in Benue State, Nigeria
Type of the 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	I have a general feeling, after reading the manuscript that it is of poor value and very limited scientific impact. First of all, there are mistakes in the scientific writing which cannot be accepted. For example, the reference (Bradford, 1999) which appears in line 31 does not exist in the list of references. In addition, in line 30, the authors refer to Orherata and Omoyakhi (2008) to declare that there is a global risk of insufficient food of animal origin to cater to a growing demand. However, in the list of references it appears that Orherata and Omoyakhi (2008) only deal with the Nigerian case and not treat such a problem at a global scale. There are also basic writing errors, like the repetition of the word 'increase' three times in the same sentence (see line 38 and 39 ... In the methodology section, there is a need to insert a map of the region to make the reader identify the study area and its location. The methodology section also lacks a more detailed presentation of the nature of the questions asked to farmers/breeders. How was the level of livestock intensification obtained? How can farmers/breeders assess such a level? In addition, one may also feel that the data are quite old, as they only encompass the period from 2007 to 2010, at a time where the manuscript is submitted in 2016. How do the authors explain that? In the results section, I feel rather confused with	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the interpretation of the trends in rearing the different species. For example, the rate of respondents rearing cattle varied from 15 to 18% from before 2007 to 2007 then it almost stabilizes to that value (i.e. 17%) from 2007 to 2010. This means that the rate of people having cattle has been steady throughout the study period, unless a statistical test proves the contrary. The same observation is valid for goats and sheep, which are reared respectively by 50 and 30% of respondents. There are no significant variations among years. When reading the paragraphs related to poultry, fish and rabbits, it appears that these species also followed the same trend: a quite stable proportion. The following section of the results deals with the variations in the level of intensification. One can only feel confused about such results, since the variables used to assess the level of livestock intensification have not been presented in the methodology section. How do the authors differentiate between semi-intensive and intensive? Does this differentiation only rely on farmers' evaluation? On which criteria is it based: level of feed concentrates' uses? The use of veterinary treatments? The use of off-farm workers? What else? From a writing point of view, there seems to be an error in line 161. The authors write 'firstly'. Then in line 165, there is the word 'thirdly'. The word 'secondly' is expected between line 161 and 165, and this is not the case. The recommendation section, which a kind of conclusion is also of poor content. As the analysis only encompasses 4 years (from 2007 to 2010), how can the authors judge the long term evolution	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of livestock in the study area? The recommendation of introducing new species (snail) is also confusing, as it seems that there are other priorities linked to limited production levels of the main species of interest (i.e. ruminants and poultry). The references section needs serious revision. It is recommended that authors cite articles from peer-reviewed journals, and avoid websites. Finally, from a presentation viewpoint, there are too many figures, in a repetitive way (charts), which is rather boring. Authors can manage the raw data obtained through the survey process in a much proper way, in order to avoid redundancies.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend serious revision to this manuscript if it is going to be published. Authors can significantly improve the writing of the paper, by adopting a series of measures related to figures' presentation, references cited and the interpretation of the results.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mohamed Taher Sraïri</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Animal Production And Biotechnology, Veterinary Medicine Institute, Morocco</i>