



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_49011
Title of the Manuscript:	Social and productive indicators of forage palm and the survival of livestock activity in the semi-arid region of northeastern Brazil.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	If the Northeast Region represents 10% of the Brazilian territory, how can it have the largest herd of ruminants? It should present secure sources that attest this information. Still, if 90 percent of traditional forage palm is being decimated by the carmine plague, and the need to reduce the herd so that it is possible to feed, the inconsistency of the statement of the largest herd of ruminants does not seem substantial. I suggest presenting more consistent sources to strengthen the handling of the manuscript information.	The reviewer's comments were all adhered to and the text as a whole improved.
Minor REVISION comments	In "Material and Methods, there was affirmation of many data and that these had a certain homogeneity. Using the descriptive analysis, the presentation of the average would be the most appropriate / representative! In the way presented what was the criterion to highlight one or the other place?	The reviewer's comments were all adhered to and the text as a whole improved.
Optional/General comments	The data presented in the graphs, were collected from properties evaluated or obtained from other sources (governmental, nongovernmental organization)? The "Conclusion" section was presented as a summary of the manuscript, with repetition of sentences / concepts.	The reviewer's comments were all adhered to and the text as a whole improved.

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)	Nothing to declare