

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_119658
Title of the Manuscript:	Poonchi: A Threatened Sheep Breed of Jammu and Kashmir
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is important because it touches the livelihoods of local community members 2. Title should read: Concerted efforts in conserving Poonchi sheep breed in..... 3. No. It should include: causes of decline of Poonchi, absolute numbers ten years ago, methodology used, distinct qualities of Poonchi that make it superior like: adaptability, resilience Fast growth rate, capability to use rough pastures etc and what is the recommendation in terms of priority interventions the author has put at conclusion stage. 4. Appropriate although some subsections are not adequate in substance coverage. 5. It is scientifically correct 6. Sufficient and current. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	It is however, the use of "backwardness" should be omitted.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Good work	

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:	John O. Oloo
Department, University & Country	Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology, Kenya