

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_99982</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Semi- Intensive Native Chicken Farming Integrated with Pig Farming- An Economic Analysis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research</b>

### **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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>

## 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The whole document needs extensive proofreading and editing</p> <p>The abstract is clear. It reflects the paper's content and intended objective.</p> <p>Keywords are good</p> <p>The introduction and background are adequate and are validated with relevant reported research. Proofreading is needed [see attached scanned Manuscript]. Add missing citations to the ref list</p> <p>The methodology representation is adequate but very brief.</p> <p>The results are fine in their Table forms and adequate for the discussion to reach the paper's objective</p> <p>The discussion is adequate and validated by the reported literature for comparison purposes.</p> <p>The conclusion is adequate</p> <p>Recommendations are adequate</p> <p>Review the references' write-up carefully for consistency, and completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements. Make sure to add the missing citations to the list</p> <p>Proofreading and editing are needed</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon