



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_34934
Title of the Manuscript:	Profitability and Factors Affecting Milk Supply: An Empirical Study on Dairy Farms in Chittagong Districts of Bangladesh
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	This paper has merit as a contribution to understanding the (1) constraints to formalizing collection and processing of milk in Bangladesh and (2) contribution to poverty alleviation. Major problems are listed here. p3. The use of a BCR is completely inappropriate here, and is incorrectly calculated. Gross returns are not "benefits". The whole use of BCR in this paper should be removed. A better indicator is average net returns per cow per farm over feed costs. Multiple examples in the literature. p5. Table 2 has some major errors. Total returns is incorrect. There is a difference between Revenue and Returns. Please ask an economist to help you with this – the information is of interest, but this table demonstrates a lack of understanding of basic business tools (e.g., the income statement). Also, as noted, the BCR is incorrect and inappropriate here. The value of the paper is substantially diminished due to multiple grammatical and punctuation errors. The authors are strongly advised to seek the assistance of a copy editor.	Corrections have been made, but in the case of BCR please see the references number 8 (This paper was presented at the International Dairy Conference at Bangladesh Agricultural University held on 3-5 April 2010 and also the published at Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Economics) and 9. Correction has been made
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some tables (e.g., Table 1) require full or better descriptive titles. The Introduction is an overly long single paragraph.	Variables descriptions are inserted in the main text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Needs dividing into paragraphs. Same for Conclusions – use two paragraphs. “lac” is an unknown term outside SAsia – use internationally recognized numbers The formula for Net Return (p. 3) is missing some parentheses to make it clearer Is TFC extrapolated from two months reported milk? This would be worrying – no accounting for seasonality. Regression is unsurprising – more cows = more milk. Suggest less space used to describe the unremarkable conclusion that more cows = more milk per farm. Also, it would be a much better indicator if you *normalized* the dependent variable – e.g., avg. milk per cow per farm would be a much better choice for dep variable. Use commas in numbers with more than 3-4 pre-decimal digits. It is not clear what the difference is between the collectors (3.3) and the Goalas (3.4). This is important because one makes a higher margin than the other. Suggest you clarify this in the paper. For p-values, use four decimals. $P < 0.00$ is more correct than $P = 0.00$, but needs four decimal places. Fully state what DLS and NGO mean before using the initials. There are no comparisons to other research findings for Bangladesh. Plenty of examples in the literature – suggest you add compare and contrast with other	Correction has been made Correction has been made Correction has been made TFC was calculated based on considering depreciation Please see the references 15, 16, 17, and 18 in the revised paper. These are international literature. Commas have incorporated in main text Definition of collectors and goalas has been incorporated in main text Suggestions have been incorporated in main text Elaboration of DLS and NGO has incorporated in the revised paper. Suggestions have been incorporated in main text
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	research findings.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	An important finding is that milk collection/ processing is less organized than it could be and that contracting could change that (many examples from BGD). Figure 1 is particularly interesting and I suggest you make more of this information and less of the returns data (table 1). This figure speaks volumes. Milk Vita is only taking 1/3 of the volume produced. Is this because of the contracting issue mentioned, or Milk Vita does not want/need the milk, or the sweetshops give a better price, etc.? How might government or NGO intervention change or influence this to benefit small scale producers?	Suggestions have been incorporated in article