

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123019</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Export Dynamics and Strategic Directions: Analyzing India's Livestock Sector</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	The conclusions of the research are not contributing to the scientific knowledge. The study only indicates the use of typical statistics about exports without novelty. It is important that the authors rethink the methodological design to multivariate classification, causal-correlation, or time series model with the corresponding indicators and tables for verifying the results and for evaluating the potential knowledge contribution.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of reflect the content of the study.	
<b>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.</b>	There are not indicated the following: problem statement (precising the lack of knowledge with was covered in part or totally with the study), conclusions which reveal knowledge contribution, and recommendations for future research.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	I suggest to rethink the paper with the indications of the first comment.	
<b>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.</b>	I suggest to rethink the paper with the indications of the first comment. The study does not have scientific contribution. The study does not have robust methodological design.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Only four of 18 references have less than five years of antiquity. The authors must realize a deep literature review before the beginning of a scientific study. There are six of 18 references with anonymous author too.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English redaction requires proof-reading.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	My recommendation is to reject the paper because there are not knowledge contribution nor rigorous scientific methodology.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emigdio Antonio Alfaro Paredes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centro de Investigacion Cientifica e Innovacion Global, Peru</b>