

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_120664
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of inter- community conflicts on beef cattle production among pastoral communities of Marsabit County, Kenya
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://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

Compulsory 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>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a critical issue affecting livestock production in a specific region of Kenya. It provides insights into how inter-community conflicts directly impact beef cattle production, a vital economic activity in arid and semi-arid regions. This can help other researchers and policymakers understand the unique challenges faced by pastoral communities.</p> <p>I like this manuscript because it addresses a highly relevant issue that intersects agriculture, socio-economics, and conflict resolution, providing valuable data and recommendations for improving beef cattle production amidst conflict.</p> <p>However, the structuring of the manuscript and language should be improved (more concise language) to enhance readability and ensure that key points are easily understood by a broader audience.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable as it clearly conveys the focus of the research.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is quite comprehensive but could benefit from a brief introduction to the broader context of beef cattle production in Marsabit County.</p> <p>The research design and sampling technique are stated but more details on the methods used for data collection and analysis, type of questionnaire used and the statistical methods applied should also be captured.</p> <p>Focus on the key findings that directly address the research objective. Highlight the most significant impacts of inter-community conflicts on beef cattle production.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for a research paper. However, the literature review section should be summarized and merged with the introduction.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I think that the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for the following reasons. In the first place, the research design is well-structured, except for one or two concerns highlighted elsewhere above, because it utilized a descriptive survey study design and stratified sampling technique, which ensures a representative sample of the population.</p> <p>Secondly, the data collection process is quite thorough with a high response rate of 93.1%, which strengthens the reliability of the findings.</p> <p>Additionally, the study employed validated research instruments, as evidenced by the pilot study (even though details of the pilot study were not captured under the methodology) and high Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, indicating strong internal consistency. Finally, the inclusion of correlation and regression analysis made the statistical analysis comprehensive and provided an understanding of the relationships between some variables.</p> <p>However, the methodology has to be revised in terms of the write up.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references include recent sources, with citations from 2018 to 2022, indicating that the research incorporates up-to-date literature. This shows the study's relevance and alignment with current trends and findings in the field. However, to further strengthen the manuscript, it may be beneficial to include additional recent studies on inter-community conflicts and beef cattle production from regions with similar socio-economic and environmental conditions. This would go a long way to provide a broader context and enhance the robustness of the literature review and discussion.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few areas where improvements can be made. The clarity and readability of the manuscript can be enhanced by addressing some grammatical errors, improving the structure of some sentences, and ensuring consistent use of tense and terminology. See manuscript for details</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Manuscript should have been line-numbered to facilitate references to specific line.</p> <p>Introduction: Ensure consistent use of terms. For example, use "beef cattle production" consistently instead of alternating with "beef livestock farming." A few of the in-text citations were not properly written. Provide more background on the significance of Marsabit County specifically, and how it compares to other regions in terms of conflict and beef cattle production.</p> <p>Liteterature review: Should be summarised and added to relevant portions of the introduction. Several of the statements need revision to make them clear. (See manuscript for specific comments on these). Organize the literature review to follow a logical flow. Ensure each paragraph transitions smoothly to the next. Some studies are mentioned without enough detail on their findings or relevance. Provide a deeper analysis of key studies and how they directly relate to your research questions</p> <p>Research methodology: The methodology as reported in the manuscript was sketchy and not very coherent. I expected aspects such as study area (with maps showing clear demarcations of area(s) covered), climate and vegetation of the study area as these have implications for feed availability for cattle, target population and sample size, sampling procedure, data collection procedure, data analysis and ethical considerations etc clearly spelt out as sub-headings. Details of the information the questionnaires sought to elicit from respondents as well as the type of questionnaire used were not stated. Provide more details about the pilot study in Isiolo County, such as its findings and how it informed the main study. Expand on the ethical considerations section to include more details on how participants' privacy and consent were handled. This part has to be rewritten with the necessary details to make it possible for other scientists to be able to follow to repeat the study.</p> <p>Results and discussion This section should be captioned 'results' since the discussion was written separately after the presentation of results. I gathered here that the questionnaire only had 5 items. There was nothing on the demographics of respondents. Nothing whatsoever on production indices and husbandry practices these farmers are engaged in. These pieces of information would have painted a clear picture of the kind of beef cattle production being negatively impacted by the inter-community conflicts.</p> <p>Did you administer the questionnaires to individual farmers or farmer groups? You spoke about some 200 registered agricultural groups under 'Research methodology' and made reference to some 320 questionnaires that were given out. Clarify this</p> <p>I don't think Table 1 is necessary, the information therein was mentioned in the opening statement under results and discussion.</p> <p>Most of the sub-headings under results and discussion were sketchy and need to be revised. See manuscript for details</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Table numbers and title must be on the same line separated by colon.</p> <p>Almost all of the statistical tools employed were not stated in the methodology, that is, reliability statistics, correlation and ANOVA. Please ensure these are all appropriately captured under the research methodology.</p> <p>Ensure all tables and figures are properly formatted and labeled. Each should have a clear title and explanation of what it represents.</p> <p>Discuss the implications of the findings in more detail. For instance, explain how the fear of cattle loss or human life directly impacts cattle production decisions.</p> <p>References Some of the in-text references are not listed under the reference section. Some of the references listed are also not cited in the text. These have been flagged in the manuscript. See manuscript for the details. A few of the references have not been quoted fully. See manuscript for details</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alhassan Osman
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana