

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126686
Title of the Manuscript:	Typology of Grasscutter (<i>Thryonomys swinderianus</i>) Farming in Southern Benin Two Decades After Its Domestication
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant as it provides a comprehensive examination of grasscutter farming in southern Benin, two decades after its domestication. It identifies different farming practices, socio-economic conditions, and constraints that affect the sector. The study's findings could inform policy changes aimed at improving the grasscutter farming sector in Benin and similar regions. I find the manuscript valuable for its detailed analysis and identification of critical bottlenecks that need addressing. The insights provided could potentially help in enhancing the sustainability of grasscutter farming and its commercialization.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the manuscript is clear and accurately reflects the study's focus on grasscutter farming in southern Benin. However, a more specific title could potentially enhance clarity, such as: <i>"Typology and Challenges of Grasscutter Farming in Southern Benin Two Decades Post-Domestication."</i></p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, outlining the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, I suggest incorporating a brief mention of the primary constraints faced by farmers, which would provide a more balanced overview.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections that make it easy to follow. The flow of information from the introduction to the conclusion is logical and cohesive.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically sound. The methodology is appropriate for the study's objectives, and the analysis is robust. The use of snowball sampling and MCA is a valid approach for categorizing farmers and understanding the dynamics of grasscutter farming. The study's findings are substantiated by statistical analysis using SAS software, ensuring that the conclusions are data-driven and credible.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and relevant. However, the manuscript could benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies that have addressed the challenges of domesticated wildlife farming, especially grasscutters, in other parts of Africa. This would allow for more cross-regional comparisons.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is appropriate for a scholarly audience, though there are occasional minor grammatical issues. I recommend a thorough proofreading for sentence clarity and coherence. Phrasing could be improved in some areas to enhance readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are no evident ethical issues with the research as it involves a survey of grasscutter farmers and does not raise concerns regarding animal welfare or human rights. The sampling method appears transparent, and informed consent is implied through participation.</p> <p>The study is well-conducted and provides valuable insights into grasscutter farming in Benin. Minor revisions are needed in the language, clarity of the abstract, and inclusion of a few more recent references.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Amratan Gautam
Department, University & Country	Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, India