

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122901
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-economic Sustainability of Rearing Deoni Cattle in Bidar District of Karnataka
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The article investigates the socio-economic importance of the Deoni cattle breed to smallholder cattle farmers in Bidar district. The author/s uses a sample of 120 respondents to illustrate the significance of Deoni cattle to households using two indices, (i) Social sustainability and economic sustainability. Findings indicate that majority of the respondents belong to medium social and economic sustainability. However, the article summarises that majority of the respondents are poor and cannot afford to rear improved crossbreed, therefore, policy should focus on improvising the Deoni cattle breed because it is sustainable and adaptive to the area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable because cattle production and rearing is an important component of smallholder farmers in terms of livelihood and social status.	
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.	No, the abstract is not comprehensive enough. For example, in the abstract the author/s mention about two indices, i.e, social sustainability index and economic sustainability index, however, under the methodology section, the author/s combines or mention socio-economic sustainability index? Are these two the same? Furthermore, the issue of socio-equity is mentioned without prior definition for clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate. However, the author/s should re-check to ensure that they adhere to the journal requirements.	
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.	The article is poor on the methodological approach. The assumptions of using the SSI, ESI and SESI as indices for this article are not clearly stated apart from the reference to FAO (1991) and Swaminathan (1991). This requires further clarification. Furthermore, adoption of the methodology developed by Rahman (2011) is not justified clearly. The author/s mention the relationship between the independent variables and socio-economic sustainability of Deoni cattle rearing. However, the independent variables are not clearly defined in this article. The correlation results presented in table 7 is minimally explained and are not included in the abstract. There is no methodological contribution.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are orderly and well cited. However, there is a need for the author/s to look at the latest sources because the recent spells of climate variability have brought new dimension to farming, particularly livestock farming and breed selection. Making reference to sources of 1991 illustrate that the author/s are ignoring latest research work on livestock sustainability.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Yes, the usage of the language is appropriate, however, grammar and sentence construction can be improved with proper proof reading.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Commented [KK1]: This is too long. The source is very old, the author should consider looking for newer source. Because the dynamics of sustainable agricultural development has changed over time because of the severe climatic variation, since 1991.

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:	Kennedy Muzamai Kalundu
Department, University & Country	University of Namibia, Namibia