



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_30396
Title of the Manuscript:	Feeds and Forage Availability, Utilization and Management practices for Livestock in some selected Coastal Areas 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	Throughout the manuscript details of language use (wording) could be revised to provide more direct and concise statements. For an international publication, some terms require definition including: upazilas, decimal (as used in Table 2), and semi-intensive and extensive management systems (as used on page 9 lines 182-183) The list of districts in the text on page 3 lines 76-79 should be deleted because they duplicate information in Table 1. Provide a footnote stating exactly what the % columns list (Is this the percent of farmers in each class who have this land use?) Should the "Totals" in both Tables 2 and 3 be "Overall" or "Average"? More information for data in Table 6 would be helpful. Were such accurate and complete milk production data obtained with the survey? How many households provided this complete information? How were the data analysed statistically? What means separation procedure was used?	Done Done Done Average values We are collected the 540 farmers information regarding dairying and already mention the procedure of the analysis in the manuscripts.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	On page 13 line 262, should “52 different species of grasses under 12 families” be “species of herbaceous plants in 12 families” or “grasses under 12 genera” rather than “families”? Plants identified by common name on pages 12-14 and in Table 10 should also be identified by scientific name (genus and species). However, careful attention to details with the written presentation throughout the manuscript can provide a considerably improved paper.	Completed Done We are trying to implement this suggestion in the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Perhaps use “lack of knowledge regarding fodder cultivation” rather than “unconsciousness”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Is there any explanation for the differences in number of cattle noted in relation to References 8 and 9?	