



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_34675
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Existing Livestock Manure Management Practices in 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Line 6. Conventional management. . It is being Line 45 to 46: gradual increase of crop intensities, if livestock manure based fertilizer is used as a source of soil nutrients [8]). The parenthesis is closed but is not opened before. Line 117 to 118: No difference was observed in cattle population in humid, sub-humid and rain-fed region. What is the situation about buffalo, small ruminant, poultry and ducks? Statistical analysis can be also done between buffalo for each livestock system. The same thing for small ruminant and poultry and ducks. Letter a, b c, d, ... can be utilized to make differences between means. Line 120: Small ruminants Table 2: 5th line: Small ruminants Line 121 to 122: and farmers of remaining two region rears sheep and gat sporadically. This part of the sentence is not clear. Please, check. Line 137: Change [13], may be categorized Line 145: (Table 2). A major	Agreed and done Agreed and done Animal number was an imposed factor, onlcommercial (an average 15 large animal pefarm) and subsistence (an average 2 large animal per farm) farms of different regionswere randomly selected. Table-1 describesland and animal holding characteristics of tselected farmers, and it may not represent typical distribution of farm animals in the regions. Thus, no statismade here. The title of Trephrased accordingly. Agreed and done Agreed and done Agreed and done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	9. Table 2. The sum of percentages of Management systems of Dairy cattle in not equals to 100 %. Why? The same thing for other cattle management system. 10. Line 152: Among three greenhouse gases methane is ~~meior~~ major one whose 11. Line 155 to 156 : farm animals under different management systems was estimated to be 6.77, 6.41, 5.42, 0.203 and 0.024, ~~respectively, of a dairy or other cattle, buffalo, small ruminant or poultry, respectively (Table-2)~~ of a dairy, other cattle, buffalo, small ruminant and poultry, respectively (Table-2). 12. Line 156: Small ruminants 13. Table 3. Small ~~ruminant~~ ruminants 14. Line 163: If BER (2016) is an author, please, put it in the references. 15. Please see the attached file (Table 4).	Agreed and done Agreed and done It was simply due to exlpoint in solid storage andsystems, added and show Agreed and done Agreed and done Agreed and done Agreed and done Two additional columns without any heading are added in the new format of Table4; no comment or suggestion is found, thus no revision is made in Table 4, except landscape placing
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		