

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_87435
Title of the Manuscript:	HALAL GOAT PRODUCTION SYSTEM
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://www.journalsrr.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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>"HALAL GOAT PRODUCTION SYSTEM"</b></p> <p>This manuscript has been reviewed by myself and Manuscript found suitable for publication in the Journal of Scientific Research and Reports (Major revision).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The topic and subject matter are suitable for the Journal of Scientific Research and Reports. Since the Journal of Scientific Research and Reports is an international journal, it should be written in which country the study was conducted. For example, I don't know where is Maguindanao.</li> <li>2. The paper makes a sound and useful contribution to knowledge.</li> <li>3. The title is not appropriate. Halal Goat Production System in Maguindanao, Country???</li> <li>4. The introduction provides an unnecessary amount of general background information. There is very little information. In the introduction, information about halal animal practices should be given, especially with the support of the reference in the country and other countries.</li> <li>5. More details should be given in the materials and methods section. For example, when was the study done? What breeds of animals were on the farms? What was the herd size? Such as daily milk yield and milking practices...eg</li> <li>6. The tables provided is complex but appear relevant for the purposes of providing the data for review.</li> <li>7. The discussion part is not enough. With the support of references, comparisons with the applications in the country and other countries should be made and a wing should be reached. May be a comparison can be made under this heading with applications in other animal species.</li> <li>8. It should add lots of references to the article.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

## Review Form 1.6

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Ali Risvanli</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Firat University, Turkey</b>