

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_96297
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumer preference for goat meat in Sierra Leone
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Of course, it is important but it lacks coherence and enumerative evidences</p> <p>Yes, the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive. It should contain numerical evidences</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate. The subsections are in line with the appropriateness of the study</p> <p>It is correct, but the statistical analysis didn't compute based on the four cities of Sera lion. The discussion is very shallow, it needs a detail discussion</p> <p>The reference are not sufficient, because the manuscript needs detail discussion, thus additional reference is required. Also some of the references are out-dated</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The grammatical construction of this manuscript is not good. It needs rewrite and correct all contents of the manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The topic is very good, but the abstract is very shallow and lacks numerical value</p> <p>The introduction lacks the gap and justification of the study The result contains the total information rather than for each cites The discussion is very shallow and didn't contain recent information</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Melkamu Bezabih Yitbarek
Department, University & Country	Debre Markos University, Ethiopia