

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_91021
Title of the Manuscript:	A cross sectional study on some aspects of reproduction scenario and prevalence of reproductive disorders 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:

(<https://www.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Abstract: The abstract summarized the study but did not flow smoothly. Many sentences need to be recast to make them clear. There was no clear distinction between the end of the methods and results sections. 'Small holder' should be used in place of 'locals' in describing the production systems.</p> <p>words: 'Reproductive technologies' shouldn't be a keyword because it didn't feature much in the work.</p> <p>Introduction: The problem statement could have been better and didn't seem to be in tandem with the major objective. Both should be synergized.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: There is need for a map showing the study area. How was the sample size determined? What is the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the herds sampled? The method used in questionnaire administration is confusing: Did the authors use questionnaire and face-to-face interviews (oral interview) or did they use interviewer-administered questionnaire to administer the questionnaire?</p> <p>Results and Discussion: There was no clear distinction between the results and the discussion. The discussions were scanty and there was no clear comparison between the findings of the study and other similar works. Inferences of the findings of the study were lacking in all the parts of this section. Many sentences need to be recast.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion need to summarize the findings of the study not just a general statement as it is.</p> <p>References: Well written. All cited materials were referenced and the referenced were cited.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Akwoba Joseph Ogugua
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria