

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_99258
Title of the Manuscript:	Multi-institutional model for the delivery of livestock technology needs in Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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><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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is an interesting research article that needs to be published. It clearly mentions the need for multi- institutional approaches to make the technology available to farmers and pastoral communities. In order to improve the quality of this article, the following points should be noted</p> <p>No, Establishment of multi-institutional model for the delivery of livestock technology needs in arid and semi-arid areas of Kenya</p> <p>No, it is needs to given in a better manner</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References are insufficient.</p> <p>Authors should describe how the samples were collected</p> <p>Authors should describe methodologies for ranking diseases, constraints and priority technology.</p> <p>Authors must to use an appropriate statistical technique to convey the findings.</p> <p>The information on multi-institutional models and its impact on pastoral communities are insufficient</p> <p>In the discussion part, it is important to make explicit comparisons with previous research. It seems like the material in the recommendations section is being duplicated.</p> <p>Please define the abbreviations in the abstract and in the manuscript as well as possible</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, but a minor correction is needed (indicated in the reviewed manuscript copy)	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Authors should cite manuscripts in both the table of contents and the bibliography according to journal norms	

### 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 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>A. Singaravadivelan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tamil Nadu Veterinary Animal Sciences University, India</b>